The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." *St. Augustine.*

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 97
Universal Jubilee extended to world—Instruction of S. Apost. Penitentiary on Jubilee Year—Decree of S.C. of Rites on the restoring of the vigil of Easter to its primitive position.

BISHOP WILLSON, VII,
Rt. Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 111

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. .. Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 120
THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS, III.
The Meaning of Sacrifice.

MORAL THEOLOGY .. Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 134
Place for hearing Sunday Mass—Sterility Tests.

CANON LAW .. .. Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 142
Trading forbidden to clerics and religious—Baptism administered privately by a nurse.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 151
Processional Cross carried during Stations of the Cross—Dedication of wooden altar—Renewal of Paschal Candle—Blessing of hall before Mass—Reservation of Eucharist without weekly Mass—Alterations in Roman Pontifical concerning the administration of the Sacrament of Order—New invocation in Litany of Loreto—Text of new Mass for the Assumption of Our Lady, August 15.

HOMILETICS .. .. Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 157
The Fruits of Holy Communion.

NOTES 160
New Light on the death of Erasmus.

BOOK REVIEWS 164
Les Livres des Maccabées (Abel); *De Censuris* (Cappello); *Epistemology* (Van Steenberghen); *De La Salle* (Battersby); *The Mary Book* (Sheed); *De Gratia Christi* (Daffara); *Easy does it* (Reilly); *Catherine McAuley* (Savage); *The Didache* (*Tr.* Kleist); *Arnobius* (*Tr.* McCracken); *Mother Patrick of Paris* (Maire); *The Unknown God* (Noyes); *The Gospel Story, Vol.* 1 (Cox); *Saints are not sad* (Sheed); *Two in one Flesh* (Messenger); *S. Thom. Aquin. X libros ethicorum Aristot. ad Nicomachum expositio* (*Ed.* Spiazzi); *S. Thom. Aquin. In Aristot. libros de sensu et sensato; De Memoria et reminiscentia commentarium* (*Ed.* Spiazzi); *On Prayer* (Caussade); *In the Furrow of the Cross* (M. Maria) [p. 119]; *The Month* [p. 150]; *Going God's Way* (Beattie) [p. 163].

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Aprilis, 1951.

Official Documents

PAPAL ACTS

Apostolic Constitution

whereby the Universal Jubilee, celebrated at Rome in 1950, is extended to the Catholic world.

PIUS BISHOP
servant of the servants of God
to all the faithful who shall see the present letters
greeting and apostolic blessing.

Throughout the Holy Year, which yesterday, with the customary solemn rite used in this Mother City, We brought to a close, innumerable multitudes flocked to Rome. They came in order to find expiation and cleansing, to find pardon of their sins from God, and to gain for themselves or for the faithful departed the plenary indulgence of the Jubilee. The sight of those immense crowds was a supreme consolation to Us, for We are confident that from the ardent piety, in which the visiting pilgrims competed with the Roman people, there shall arise that moral renewal which is so desired by Us and by every good man—a moral renewal which our times so urgently demand.

However, everybody could not come to Rome. Many were prevented from making the journey not only by economic stress, which especially afflicts the poorer classes, not only by old age, infirmity, sickness or other such causes, but also by the conditions obtaining in not a few nations, conditions which do not allow pilgrimages.

Hence We are following the custom of Our Predecessors in deciding that the Jubilee treasure of pardon which up to yesterday was open to all in Rome, should, throughout the whole of the coming year, be open to all the faithful everywhere. This extension of the Jubilee establishes the hope that the now springtime of spiritual life, which so delighted Us during the months gone by, will continue its bloom and bring forth more and more abundant fruits of piety. May that wonderful spectacle of Christian faith and devotion, which excited such admiration in this Holy City, be repeated in every city, town and village of the world.

To bring about this happy result, let Our Venerable Brethren, the Bishops and other local Ordinaries, see that their flocks are opportunely instructed about the matter, and stirred up to use the opportunity of

gaining those spiritual benefits to the full. Our desire is that this should be done by means of Missions to the people or of Spiritual Exercises. Experience has indeed shown that this sort of preaching of the word of God to the people is of great efficacy not only to rebut errors, but also to set christian doctrine in clearer light, and to secure, by the help of divine grace, a turning towards the good things of heaven. Those who thus hear the word of God are drawn from earthly things to the things of heaven; they rid themselves of sin and its effects, and are stimulated to walk in the arduous path of virtue, with sincere and generous goodwill. Hence We have it at heart that, as far as possible, throughout the coming year, such Missions be held in each parish. This will be the best way to prepare the faithful to obtain the pardon of their sins and the full indulgence of the penalties due to them.

Let the Bishops, likewise, admonish the faithful to pray earnestly to God for Our intentions, as indicated in the Apostolic Letters *Jubilaeum Maximum* on the occasion of the proclamation of the Holy Year in this Mother City. Let their special prayer be that the peace, for which all are looking, may return at last to the minds of men, to domestic groups, to every nation, and to the whole community of peoples; let them pray that those who suffer "persecution for justice's sake" may have that unconquerable fortitude, which made the Church rosy from the beginning with the blood of martyrs; let them pray that refugees, prisoners, exiles may return as soon as possible to their dear native land; let them pray that social classes may, with hatreds laid aside and discords allayed, come to a union cemented by justice, fraternal concord and charity; and let them also pray that the sacred rights of the Church may be always kept safe and inviolate in the face of hostile snares, deceptions, and persecutions.

Wherefore, by the authority of Almighty God, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by Our own authority, We extend the Great Jubilee, recently celebrated in this Holy City, to the entire Catholic world. These Apostolic Letters decree that extension for the Western and the Eastern Church, and prorogue it for the whole coming year. The Jubilee may be gained from First Vespers of the coming Feast of the Circumcision of Our Lord Jesus Christ to the thirty-first of December, 1951.

Hence, the indulgence granted by Our Apostolic authority is available to all the faithful of both sexes, who live anywhere in the world outside the City of Rome and its suburbs, even though they may have gained the pardon of the Jubilee during the Holy Year just elapsed. We

now concede and grant them a full indulgence of all penalties due for their sins (the sins themselves being previously remitted) on the conditions that they receive the sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion —not the Paschal Confession and Communion, which do not suffice for the Jubilee—and, moreover, that they piously visit within the time the churches or public oratories, which are to be designated for this purpose.

All these Jubilee ordinances must be carried out according to the rules here given, which rules an "Instruction" of the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary further elucidates and authentically interprets.

I. The local Ordinaries, either personally or through approved ecclesiastics—to whom, if they so will, the Ordinaries may give this power for use during the whole year—shall designate in their *episcopal city* as places for the Jubilee visits the cathedral church and three other churches or public oratories, in which sometimes at least the Eucharistic sacrifice is customarily celebrated. In the *suburbs* and in the *rest of the diocese* they shall designate the parochial church of each parish and, within the boundaries of the same parish, three other churches or oratories, as above. The same provision shall be made in the Eastern Church by the Patriarchs and other local Ordinaries personally or through ecclesiastical delegates, each for his own eparchy or diocese.

But in missionary parts, the local Ordinaries will not draw any distinction between the Ordinary's place of residence and other parts of the territory. Let them designate four churches or public oratories in each quasi-parish or Mission station.

II. As was done in Rome during the Holy Year, so in this year of extension, one visit should be made in each church or oratory designated —on the same day or subsequent days. If there are not four churches or public oratories, the Ordinaries may, personally or through delegates, appoint that the prescribed four visits be made in a smaller number of churches.

Besides, where (in the prudent judgment of the local Ordinary) this is possible, it is very fitting that one of the four visits prescribed be made to the Cathedral Church, or to some Sanctuary specially designated.

III. The prayers to be said at each visit are as follows: *Our Father, Hail Mary, Glory be to the Father* five times; the same three prayers once again also for Our intention; the Creed once; in addition to these, three *Hail Marys,* with the invocation: Queen of peace, pray for us, and one *Hail, holy Queen.* To these may be added, at will, the prayer composed by Us for the Holy Year 1950.

As regards the Oriental Church, the faithful, in making the visits, will follow those rules, which, for the different rites, Our Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church will communicate in due time to the Patriarchs and local Ordinaries. Moreover, each local Ordinary shall have the faculty to change the prayers of the visits into other prayers, when the Jubilee visit is made privately. Whenever faithful of the Oriental Church, living outside their territories, join pilgrims of the Latin rite, they may use the forms of supplication prescribed for Latins; individually they may recite the formulae of their own rite or of the Latin rite.

IV. In order that the Jubilee visits may be made more easily, the faithful are allowed to make them outside of their own parish or diocese, but only in churches lawfully designated for each place by the local Ordinary. This permission holds, after the manner of the special local circumstances, also for the peoples under the care of Missionaries.

V. We appoint, moreover, that, just as at Rome during the Holy Year 1950, the faithful were allowed to apply this indulgence to themselves or to the faithful departed, so now also, as often as they perform the prescribed works. It must be carefully noted, however, that no works for the acquisition of another Jubilee indulgence, must be done before the works already under way for a preceding indulgence are completely finished.

VI. In view of faithful placed in special circumstances, We lay down the following:

1. Sailors and all who serve ships, if the ship in which they sail has a chapel, where Mass may be said, can make the Jubilee visits in that chapel. If not We allow them, on coming to some port, to make the Jubilee visits in any church they wish, reciting the prescribed prayers there.

2. Local Ordinaries can, either personally or through ecclesiastical delegates, in case of persons hindered from making the visits in the manner prescribed, reduce the number of the visits; or reduce the churches to be visited to a smaller number; or commute the visits into other works of piety and charity suited to the condition of the persons—By impeded persons We mean nuns, regular tertiaries, religious sisters, living in community, pious women and girls or other persons living in female institutes or conservatoria; also anchorites professing a regular monastic order, and given to contemplative rather than active life, like the reformed Cistercians of La Trappe, the Camaldolese Hermits, and the Carthusians—those, likewise, who are held captive or in prison—

also ecclesiastics or religious men who are detained in monasteries for emendation. Amongst those impeded are also to be numbered persons who at home or in hospitals are afflicted with sickness or weak health, and those who serve the sick—and, in general, all those who are prevented by a certain impediment from making the appointed visits. On a parity with these We wish to class workers, who earn their living by daily labour, and cannot abstain from it for so many hours—old people, likewise, who have passed their seventieth year.

VII. Relating to faculties to be granted to confessors approved according to law, for salutary use in hearing Jubilee confessions, We prescribe as follows:

1. Confessors shall enjoy in fulness the faculties of absolving, dispensing, commuting which they have already lawfully received either in perpetuity or for a time; this, however, within the terms of the concession.

2. Nuns and other women for the hearing of whose confessions special approbation of the Ordinary is required by the Code, may choose any confessor who has been approved by the Ordinary for both sexes. To him they may make their Jubilee confession, and to any confessor thus chosen We grant that (in hearing the Jubilee confessions only) he may exercise all faculties which he already has, in virtue of this Apostolic Constitution, for all the faithful.

3. To all confessors We grant that they may, throughout the Holy Year, in the forum of conscience and in the act of sacramental Confession, absolve any penitents whatsoever not only from all censures and sins whatsoever reserved by law to the Roman Pontiff or to the Ordinary, but also from a censure imposed *ab homine*. But the absolution granted from this censure shall not avail in the external forum.

VIII. Confessors, however, must not use these wide faculties except with due observance of the rules and exceptions, which follow:

1. They shall not absolve, except in the circumstances and the terms laid down in canon 2254 of the Code of Canon Law, those who are held by any censure reserved to the Roman Pontiff personally, or *specialissimo modo* to the Holy See. Neither shall they absolve those who have fallen under the censure of canon 2388 §1, which is reserved to the Holy See in the terms of the Decree *Lex sacri coelibatus* issued by the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary on the 18th of April, 1936, and likewise in the terms of the Declaration given by the same Sacred Penitentiary on the 4th of May, 1937; in virtue of which Decree and Declaration this censure in the special case, of which there is question,

is so reserved to the Sacred Penitentiary, that no one can ever absolve from it, except in danger of death—not even in virtue of canon 2254.

2. Similarly, they shall not absolve, unless as laid down in Canon 2254, prelates of the secular clergy vested with ordinary jurisdiction in the external forum, nor major Superiors of a Religious Congregation or Order, who have publicly fallen under excommunication *speciali modo* reserved to the Holy See.

3. They shall not absolve heretics or schismatics, who are publicly dogmatizing, unless they have abjured their heresy or schism, at least before the confessor himself and (as is proper) have already repaired, or have promised to repair (as is proper) the scandal, the reparation required being efficacious reparation. Moreover, they shall not absolve persons who are in the circumstances envisaged by the Decree of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office on Communism (July 1, 1949), unless they have sincerely and efficaciously retrieved themselves.

4. Likewise, they shall not absolve those, who have given their names to prohibited societies, Masonic and such like, unless they abjure their connection with the society, at least before the Confessor, repair the scandal, and cease from showing any co-operation or favour towards the said society; also, unless, as required by canon 2336 §2, they denounce ecclesiastics and religious whom they know to belong to such a society; unless, besides, they hand over to the absolving priest books, manuscripts and signs, which have to do with the said society, such books, manuscripts and signs to be cautiously transmitted at earliest opportunity to the Holy Office, or at least—if just and grave causes exist—to be destroyed by the Confessors themselves; otherwise, the penitent must sincerely promise to observe the above conditions as soon as possible; besides, the Confessor, according to the quality of the guilt, shall impose a grave and salutary penance and frequent sacramental Confession.

5. Those who have acquired without permission ecclesiastical goods or rights, are not to be absolved, unless they restore them, or ask a composition as soon as possible from the Ordinary or the Apostolic See. At least they must make a sincere promise to ask this composition; unless there is question of places in which other provision has been made by the Apostolic See.

6. Confessors of the Jubilee can commute all private vows—all and each, even if reserved to the Holy See, sworn vows also—into other pious works. But the vow of perfect and perpetual chastity, although

from the beginning made in religious profession, simple or solemn, and subsequently (after dispensation has been obtained for the other vows of religion) remaining firm and entire—this vow they can, likewise, for a grave cause, commute to other pious works. But, on no account, can they dispense from the same a person who in virtue of a Sacred Order is bound to the law of celibacy, even though he has been reduced to the lay state. The vow of not sinning or other penal vows Confessors must not commute, unless into a work which, not less than the vow itself curbs and keeps the subject from sin.

7. The Jubilee Confessors may dispense, in the forum of conscience and sacramental Confession only, from any irregularity contracted from an occult crime. Also, they may dispense from the irregularity mentioned in canon 985, 4°; but, in this case, only in order that the penitent may exercise Orders already received without danger of infamy or scandal, the burden being meanwhile laid on the penitent of recurring, under penalty of reincidence, within a month, to the Sacred Penitentiary, and standing by its mandates.

8. Jubilee Confessors may also dispense, for the forum of conscience and the sacramental forum only, from an occult impediment of consanguinity in the third or second degree (sixth or fourth as calculated by Orientals) in the collateral line, even if it touches first (fourth or third amongst Orientals), such occult impediment arising from unlawful generation, only for the convalidation of marriage, not for contracting it.

9. Where ever there is question of marriage contracted or to be contracted, the Jubilee Confessors may dispense from the occult impediment of crime, neither party engineering it (neutro tamen machinante); enjoining, in the first case private renewal of consent, according to canon 1135; imposing in both cases, a salutary, grave and long penance.

10. As regards the visits to the four churches: In the case of persons, who cannot make them in the prescribed way, Jubilee Confessors have the faculty of giving a dispensation, for a just cause, from the visitation of a particular church, commuting it—if possible—into a visit to another church; they also have the faculty to reduce the number of the visits. In the case of persons, who are prevented by sickness or some other lawful impediment from visiting the appointed churches, the Jubilee Confessors may commute the prescribed visits into other pious works which the persons concerned are able to perform. But the Confessors should bear in mind that the burden is on their own consciences, if they exempt the faithful from such visits lightly and without

a just cause. In cases, in which they dispense from the visits, they must not allow the persons thus dispensed to omit the prayers, which are to be said for Our intentions. These can be separated from the visits. In favour of sick people they may be reduced.

11. From the prescribed confession (which cannot be either an invalid confession nor the annual obligatory confession) Jubilee Confessors must exempt no one, not even a person who has no necessary matter.

12. As regards Communion, it is altogether unallowable to commute this requirement into other pious works, unless in the case of sick persons who are altogether impeded from receiving the Holy Eucharist. For the gaining of the Jubilee We wish Communion received as Viaticum to suffice; but not the Communion of Paschal precept. A person, however, who has sinfully neglected the Paschal Communion, can, subsequently, satisfy both obligations with one Communion.

13. Jubilee Confessors can use the faculties here described with all the faithful of the Church, whether of the Occident or of the Orient, if these come to confess to them with the intention and with sincere and firm determination of mind and will to gain the Jubilee.

Jubilee Confessors, however, can only use the faculty of absolving from sins and ecclesiastical censures and that of dispensing from irregularity once only with the same penitent, that is, when he first gains the Jubilee.

The other faculties—even that of reducing the visits and commuting as under No. 10—they can always exercise in favour even of the same penitent.

Should any one, having begun the prescribed works with the intention of gaining the Jubilee, be unable, owing to sickness to fulfil the required number of visits, We grant, as a gracious gesture towards his piety and promptness of will, the favour of the Jubilee on the conditions of Confession and Communion. Having confessed and communicated he gains the indulgence, as if he had fulfilled all the appointed works.

All that is set forth and declared in these Apostolic Letters We wish to be and to remain firm and valid, to the effect of extending the Jubilee to the whole Catholic world, everything to the contrary notwithstanding. To copies and excerpts of the same Letters, if signed by the hand of some public notary and stamped with the seal of some ecclesiastical dignitary, We wish the same credit to be given as should be given to these present, were they shown or exhibited.

Let it not be lawful, therefore, for any one to infringe this page of

Our concession, will and declaration or rashly oppose it. If anyone presumes to do so, let him know that he shall incur the indignation of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the twenty-fifth day of December, feast of the Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty, the twelfth of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

* * * *

SACRED APOSTOLIC PENITENTIARY

Instruction

to all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other local Ordinaries, on the Jubilee Year now being extended to the whole world.

Since the universal Jubilee, celebrated in this Mother City, has just been extended to the Catholic world by the Apostolic Constitution *Per annum sanctum,* it is very important that the ordinances of that Apostolic Constitution be accurately, prudently, and diligently fulfilled.

Hence, Our Most Holy Lord Pius XII by divine Providence Pope has ordered the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary to expound in detail and authentically interpret the regulations of the said Apostolic Constitution.

Hence, this Instruction is addressed to all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops and other local Ordinaries, not only for their own consideration but to be diligently set before the clergy and people and especially before Confessors.

The special regulations and authentic interpretation in question are as follows:

I. The faithful, who wish to gain the Jubilee Indulgence should know, in the first place, that the conditions imposed by the Apostolic Constitution are *four*: namely, Sacramental Confession, Communion, a prescribed number of visits, and the recital during those visits of certain presented prayers.

II. The Confession and Communion required for gaining the Jubilee may come before, between, or after the visits to the four churches. The one important and necessary thing is that the *last* of the prescribed works be done in the state of grace (can. 925, §1). If anyone, therefore, after having made his Confession, falls into mortal sin, before he has completed the last work, he must repeat his Confession, if he has still to make the Jubilee Communion; otherwise, it will be sufficient that he do the last work after an act of perfect contrition, which reconciles him with God.

III. Should anyone come to a church, for the purpose of a Jubilee visit, and find the doors closed or entrance impeded by any cause, it will be sufficient to say the prayers before the doors. But the visit thus made from outside must be pious and devout, that is, carried out with the intention of worshipping God. The exterior reverence of the Jubilee visitor should manifest this pious intention in some way.

IV. The vocal prayers prescribed may be said by several persons in alternating voices. The dumb are provided for in canon 936.

V. Confessors should know and clearly realize that they can use their extraordinary faculties only with penitents who present themselves for confession with the intention and sincere purpose of gaining the Jubilee. But, if the penitent should afterwards change his mind and give up the acquisition of the Jubilee indulgence, omitting the other works, all absolutions from censures, except those given for reincidence, and also all commutations and dispensations which the penitent has received, remain in force.

Confessors may use those faculties in the internal forum even extra-sacramentally, provided there is not question of faculties for which sacramental Confession is expressly required.

Parish Priests, however, have the faculty to dispense from the Jubilee visits, to reduce them and commute them (according to VIII, 10, of the Constitution) not only for penitents, but also for individual faithful and particular families of their parish.

VI. Since the faculty of absolving from sins and ecclesiastical censures, as also of dispensing from irregularity, is so circumscribed, that throughout the Jubilee year it can only be used once with the same penitent, that is, when he is gaining the Jubilee for the first time—since also it is not for use, when the penitent has already received from a Jubilee Confessor absolution from such sins and censures or dispensation from irregularity, it is altogether necessary for Confessors to ask each penitent bound by those sins, censures or irregularity the following questions:—

1. Has he already gained the Jubilee of 1951 or not?

2. If he has not gained it, has he, during 1951, already been absolved from reserved sins and censures, or dispensed from irregularity? If from the first of January, 1951, he has either gained the Jubilee, or has been absolved from such sins or censures, or dispensed from irregularity, he cannot again receive such absolution and dispensation.

VII. Confessors should take care to know previously and to remember the list of sins, censures, penalties and impediments, the abso-

lution or dispensation of which is not included in the faculties granted them. If any such cases come their way, let them remember that they cannot provide for the penitent otherwise than by the religious observance of what the Code prescribes in canons 2254, 2290, 1045 §3.

VIII. Confessors must not omit the imposition of a salutary sacramental penance on each penitent, even when they may rightly conjecture that the penitent will gain the Jubilee pardon in its fulness.

IX. No Confessor must absolve a penitent who has fallen into occult censure because of some injury done to another, before the penitent has made satisfaction to the injured party, repairing the scandal and making good the damage. At least, if the penitent cannot make this satisfaction beforehand, he must truly and solemnly promise to make satisfaction at the earliest opportunity.

X. Confessors, who can absolve from public censure, must bear the following in mind:

If any person is under censure by name and publicly declared to be such, he cannot enjoy the benefit of the Jubilee as long as he has not made the satisfaction required by law in the external forum. If, however, such a person has sincerely laid aside all contumacy in the internal forum and shown himself well disposed, he may be absolved in the internal forum, for the purpose of gaining the Jubilee, with the burden of subjecting himself in the external forum to the course of the law.

XI. As regards the sin reserved *ratione sui* by canon 894, Confessors have no absolving power, except the penitent formally retracts the false denunciation, and repairs, as far as he can, the damage which perhaps hē has caused. A heavy and long penance must be imposed.

XII. Should there be question of the case (even occult) for which canon 2342 legislates, the Confessor must prohibit the penitent under pain of reincidence, to go to that religious house and its church in future. The penalties of No. 2 of the said canon remain in force.

XIII. Jubilee Confessors must not absolve apostates from religion of the excommunication laid by canon 2385, as long as they remain outside the cloister; but, if they have a firm purpose of returning to their religious profession, the Confessor, setting them a suitable length of time to put this resolution into effect, may absolve them in the internal forum, on the condition that they shall fall into the censure again, if they do not return to religion within the appointed time. Such persons must be warned that, as long as they remain outside their religious house, they are excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical actions, they are deprived of all the privileges of their religious body, they are subject to

the local Ordinary, and liable, even when they have returned, to the other penalties laid down in canon 2385. A fugitive religious, even if he has fallen under excommunication by virtue of his own religious Constitutions can, if well disposed, be absolved in the internal forum, with the imposed obligation of returning to his religious body, as soon as possible, in the same way and under the same penalty of reincidence, as is provided for apostates from religion. Besides, if he is in sacred orders, he can be absolved only on condition of observing the suspension laid by canon 2386.

XIV. When there is question of the commutation of private vows, the faculty may be used widely, in such a way that Confessors may commute, according to their prudence, such vows into works of even less merit.

XV. Jubilee Confessors shall not absolve anyone from the reading of prohibited books, especially those which in canon 2318, §1, are forbidden under pain of excommunication, unless the person who has the books, before absolution, hands them over to the Ordinary or to the Confessor himself, or to another, who has the permission to keep them: if he does not do this, he must seriously promise that he will destroy or hand them up, as soon as he can.

XVI. In regard to the commutation or dispensation of the visits, the following should be noted:

1. When anyone obtains a dispensation from visiting one or other church or oratory, without the imposition of an obligation to visit another church or oratory by way of commutation, it is to be understood that the four visits are always required, and that consequently they must be made in the other churches or oratories. They can always be made, however, in the convenient way of coming out of the church after one visit and immediately entering it to make another. Dispensation from the visitation of a particular church is not a reduction of the number of visits.

2. If anyone, besides a dispensation from visiting some particular church, looks for a reduction of the number of visits, the Confessor must prescribe the recital of as many prayers as the visits from which he dispenses; and these prayers should not be different from those which are used in making the prescribed visits.

Regarding the dispensations or commutations mentioned above, Confessors should bear in mind that they shall have it on their conscience, if they grant any such lightly and without just cause.

XVII. Since the visitation of four churches is not a work of pre-

cept *per se,* but only imposed on those who freely desire to gain the Jubilee, the obligation, whenever wholly or partially relaxed by privileged Confessors, must not be commuted into other works to which the penitent is bound by another title of obligation strictly so called.

Our Most Holy Lord Pius XII by divine Providence Pope ordered this Instruction to be published, in order that a standing and secure interpretation may be at hand both in regard to the faculties given and to the works which are enjoined for the gaining of the Jubilee pardon throughout the coming Holy Year extended to the Catholic world.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Sacred Penitentiary, the 26th day of December, 1950.

N. Card. CANALI, *Major Penitentiary.*
S. LUZIO, *Regent.*

* * * *

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES.

Decree on the Restoring of the Vigil of Easter to its primitive position.

From ancient times it has been the custom of the Church to celebrate with the greatest solemnity the Vigil of the Lord's Resurrection, which St. Augustine describes as "the Mother of all sacred vigils" (Sermo 219, P.L. 38, 1088).

The celebration of this Vigil used to take place during the hours of the night preceding the Resurrection. In the course of time and for many reasons, the celebration was anticipated to the evening, then to the afternoon and finally to the morning of Holy Saturday. This meant that certain changes were introduced, not without detriment to the original symbolism.

In our days, with the growth of investigation of the ancient Liturgy, a strong desire has become manifest to have the paschal Vigil in particular restored to its primitive splendour to its original place, namely during the hours of the night which precede Easter Sunday. A special pastoral consideration is urged in favour of this restoration—to give the people an opportunity to attend. Holy Saturday is no longer a feast day, as it was in times gone by, and consequently many of the faithful cannot attend the sacred Rite.

For these reasons, many local Ordinaries, societies of the people and Religious persons have sent petitions to the Holy See that it might be pleased to grant a restoration of the ancient paschal Vigil to the night between Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday.

The Supreme Pontiff, Pope Pius XII, received these petitions, and in his care and solicitude in an affair of such moment, entrusted the question to a Commission of experts who were to subject it to a diligent study and examination.

When the matter was referred by the undersigned Cardinal Pro-Prefect of the S. Congregation of Rites, His Holiness deigned to approve of the following rubrics for the night celebration of the Vigil of Easter, giving to the local Ordinaries the Faculty for this year to restore the night celebration of the Vigil as an experiment, and according to their prudent judgment. Accordingly, the local Ordinaries who use this Faculty are asked to inform the S. Congregation of Rites on the attendance and piety of the faithful and of the success of the restoration of the Vigil of Easter. It is forbidden to editors of books to print the rite without the express permission of the S. Congregation of Rites.

Anything to the contrary notwithstanding.

9th February, 1951.

C. Card. MICARA, Bishop of Villetri, *Pro-Prefect.*
A. CARINCI, Archbp. of Seleucia, *Secretary.*

W. LEONARD.

Bishop Willson, VII.

Summary: Bishop Willson obtains State aid for chaplains, or religious instructors from Government—Conditions imposed by Government—Willson accused of weakness—Defence of his attitude—Ten chaplains appointed in 1848 with State aid—Difficulty of obtaining priests for prison work—Names of priests engaged in work—Plight of Catholic prisoners when removed from Government stations—Lack of churches in island—Willson's repeated efforts to gain further Government aid.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTORS.

Within the boundaries of the territory included in his spiritual jurisdiction, Bishop Willson could count no less than thirty-five stations serving as temporary headquarters for gangs of men sentenced to labour on public undertakings as a punishment for real or supposed offences against law and order. Britain's transportation policy explained the existence of such establishments: their rapid growth in Van Dieman's Land could be traced to the decision of other Colonies to give no further countenance to penal settlements. Administered and regulated by a Comptroller-General, these hastily erected, and sometimes just as hastily abandoned, places of detention were financed by the Imperial Treasury. Legal recognition of religious freedom for the inmates had been gained and guaranteed before Dr. Willson assumed control of ecclesiastical affairs. His problem was to provide opportunities for Catholic worship and religious instruction; in other words, to find priests to govern and guide an unruly flock. It was no easy task.

At all the Stations, from the date of their origin, Protestant catechists or clerics had been maintained by the Government. Only at the beginning of Dr. Willson's episcopate, and largely through his efforts, was provision made for the presence and upkeep of Catholic Chaplains, or, as it will be more convenient to style them, Religious Instructors. The Bishop always did his best to have ordained *priests* selected for the office, but in a few instances and for brief terms he had to be satisfied with men not yet in Holy Orders. He was not entitled to call on these departmental priests for pastoral duties outside their prescribed field of action. The Regulations made this point very clear: "Religious Instructors are not to absent themselves from duty without permission of the Lieutenant-Governor." In like manner, a check was put to any disposition—somewhat natural in the case of the Catholic clergy—to treat their Bishop as the sole authority interested in their comings and goings: "However happy His Excellency will be at all times to pay attention to

the Bishop's suggestions, yet all official correspondence respecting the duties of a Religious Instructor in this Department, with the Comptroller-General's office, must come direct from the Religious Instructor himself".

The Vicar-General, Rev. William Hall, was never inclined to give the Government a voice in restricting the movements of priests exercising faculties in any part of Van Dieman's Land. In the Bishop's absence he generally came into collision with the Head of the Penal Department. On one occasion, for example, he ordered an Instructor to leave his Station to undertake special duties elsewhere. But in the Comptroller-General, John Hampton, he met a kindred spirit whose supremacy none might question:

"As long as the Religious Instructor holds an appointment in the Convict Department for which he receives a salary he must conform in every way with the rules and regulations which are laid down for the guidance of himself and the other officers of the Department; and under no pretence of obedience to you, his ecclesiastical superior, is he justified in breaking through the rules. Had the Instructor applied for leave of absence, His Excellency has no doubt it would have readily been granted. Had you stated that his presence in Hobart was desirable, every attention would have been paid to your wishes. But while His Excellency altogether disclaims any right or title on the part of the Comptroller-General to interfere in any way with the details of religion, or with that subordination which is due from the clergy of the Church of Rome, employed in the Convict Department, to you, their ecclesiastical superior, yet at the same time he must insist upon the observance by the clergy of those rules which have been established after full consideration as essential to the discipline of the Convict Department, and for which discipline the Comptroller-General is responsible".

Did Bishop Willson permit the civil authority to usurp powers and privileges to which no title existed? Archbishop Polding appeared to think so; to detect signs of weakness and surrender: yet it can be affirmed that the Hobart prelate ever insisted on his rights while at the same time making sure that the unfortunate men in bondage should not be deprived of spiritual comfort.

On learning, in September, 1845, that Dr. Polding was preparing to go overseas, the Bishop implored him to represent to the Secretary of State some objectionable features of the Convict Department's relations with the Catholic clergy. In July, 1846, this matter was discussed in London. Before the end of that year there came a letter from Dr. Willson himself addressed to Lord Stanley, but received by his successor in office:

"My Lord,

"I have the honour to solicit your Lordship's attention to such of the regulations made by Government for clergymen of the Convict Establishment as are at variance with, and entirely subversive of the discipline of the Church of which I am, unworthily, a Bishop.

"I beg leave to assure Your Lordship that, in the discharge of the im-

portant duty of watching over the spiritual welfare of the Catholics, free and convict, in this Colony, I feel deeply anxious to co-operate with Her Majesty's Government, and I should lament any interruption of the friendly intercourse I have the honour and happiness to enjoy.

"Permit me to state, with great deference and respect, the regulations which cause my alarm, and I trust Your Lordship will at once perceive they are at variance with the discipline of our Church, and not likely to be of benefit to Her Majesty's Government.

"That the Government should wish to exercise a certain control over the clergy and catechists employed in the Convict Department is very proper; and to it no one can reasonably object, provided that control be strictly compatible with ecclesiastical discipline, due dependence of the members on their Head. Some of the present regulations, however, are opposed to, and subversive of, ecclesiastical discipline and dependance; and cannot, I respectfully state, receive your acquiesence.

"*First*: Because the Government might appoint a Catholic clergyman or Catechist, without the approval of the Catholic Bishop, whether such clergyman or catechist were qualified according to the regulations and discipline of the Church, or not.

"*Secondly*: Because the Government might retain a clergyman or catechist in opposition to the Bishop even were such clergyman or catechist schismatical, heretical, or scandal-giving.

"By the regulations it is evident that the principle of our Church government is destroyed, and that ultimately evils of a very distressing nature will arise.

"I therefore, with great respect and earnestness, entreat Your Lordship to allow such alterations to be made in the regulations as will secure the Government all legitimate authority over the Catholic clergy and catechists in the fulfilment of prescribed duties, whilst they leave untouched the spiritual jurisdiction belonging by divine right to the Bishop. To accomplish this object I would most respectfully suggest the following regulations:

"*First*. That no Catholic clergyman or catechist should be appointed for the Convict Department without the approval of the Bishop.

"*Secondly*. That upon the Bishop withdrawing the license of a clergyman, or his sanction to a catechist retaining his situation, the Government should cease to recognise such clergyman or catechist as belonging to the service.

"*Thirdly*. That all communications referring to ecclesiastical arrangements should pass through the office of the Bishop as the Head of his Department.

"These regulations would, I trust, secure peace and harmony in the carrying out of a most arduous duty in this penal Colony, and produce that good which I am sure Your Lordship wishes.

"Before I conclude I venture to call Your Lordship's attention to the incongruity of designating Catholic clergyman as 'Religious Instructors.' By this term the priests of the Church are amalgamated in one common class with laymen and even laywomen as 'Religious Instructors.' Permit me to remark that the Catholic clergy are not merely 'Religious Instructors,' but the ministers of the Church, empowered by the spiritual authority of the Church to offer sacrifice, to administer sacraments, and to perform all the functions of the Christian Priesthood; in the language of Saint Paul, 'the dispensers of the mysteries of God'—functions of a totally different nature from those of mere Religious Instructors. I, therefore, trust Your Lordship will direct that our clergy shall be designated by their proper title: Catholic Chaplains.

"I have the honour, etc.,

+ "R. W. WILLSON.
"Catholic Bishop.

"Hobart Town, Van Diemen's Land.
2nd May, 1846".

When this communication reached London a new Secretary of State had come into office. This was Earl Grey. He issued instructions which put the Bishop's mind at ease. In practice the dangerous situation regarding appointments and cancellations had never arisen. No Instructor had ever been recognised—nor was it likely that one would seek recognition—without Dr. Willson's approval. None was changed from one station to another without his consent. Priests engaged in the penal service generally called themselves Chaplains; but this usage was rare in official documents until about the end of 1849. A "Chaplain," in Government language, was rather a clergyman in the Colonial Department having under his care a defined district with a fixed residence and a completed church; in other words a Parish Priest.

How many priests served in the Colony as Religious Instructors? Including those who acted for short periods in case of emergency, temporarily transferred from a Colonial Chaplaincy, the number was surprisingly large. Before leaving England the Bishop, with Government approval, selected two for the special work. At the end of 1844, one who had already been in the Island since 1835 was transferred at Dr. Willson's request to the Penal Department. Then Bishop Griffiths of London was asked by the Secretary of State, following despatches received from Hobart, to recommend three more clergymen for the prison settlements. Only two could then be found ready and willing to face the unknown. By the time they landed, Bishop Willson had himself sailed for England, well armed with facts and figures in support of his claim for more generous treatment of 2000 Catholics then held in custody, as well as for more than that number subject to less rigorous restraint. What was the fruit of his mission? Sanction was given for the support of five more Religious Instructors. Thus it came about that in 1848 there were for distribution, according to needs, ten priests—the highest quota supported by Government at any one time. Southport, Impression Bay, Maria Island, and Port Arthur were allotted one each; the others found more than enough to occupy their time in Stations around Hobart and Launceston. The Bishop always managed to fill a vacancy promptly and to have the Instructors placed to the best advantage so that no section of their flocks might be for long deprived of Mass and the Sacraments. To fill gaps created by resignations it was sometimes possible to employ priests who wandered over from Dr. Polding's archdiocese: in an emergency, by using the Colonial clergy, the Bishop was enabled to secure for the Catholics the full number of spiritual guides to which they were entitled by existing regulations.

Not content merely to search for and to approve men for the onerous task in hand, Bishop Willson himself took more than his share of the labour involved. Unceasing journeyings occupied days and nights; he was to be met frequently at every Station where even one member of his flock could be discovered. So zealous was Dr. Willson in this mission of mercy that he may be said to have given over, during the first half of his episcopate, most of the ordinary diocesan administration to his active and willing Vicar-General.

At the various Stations where was Mass offered? A room set apart in the main building, in a local police barracks, or in a hospital was generally put at the disposal of Catholics for all their religious exercises. At the big Port Arthur prison they had their own chapel and never used—as is sometimes asserted—the Church of which the ruins still stand. By virtue of a concession won by Dr. Willson, free colonists settled near the Government enclosure were admitted there for Sunday worship. So, too, a resident Instructor was given facilities to attend —outside his hours of departmental duty—the sick living in the immediate neighbourhood. Outside those hours, too, he could officiate in the churches at Hobart and Launceston.

No sooner had Catholic rights been conceded by the employment of their due proportion of Religious Instructors than reduction began partly owing to resignations and partly to the enforced disappearance of the smaller Stations. A glance at the lists of the clergy with the dates of commencement of duty and relinquishment of office in the Department will show how quickly the system went to pieces. Peter Wood and John Roe, who came in 1848, did not remain long enough to receive appointments. The others were: Norbert Woolfrey, 1846-1849; James Cotham, O.S.B., 1845-1851; Odillo Woolfrey, 1846-1851; Matthew Downing, O.S.A., 1852; James Luke Levermore, 1844-1853; Thomas Caldwell, O.S.B., 1855; Hugh Magorian, 1848-1856; William Bond, 1844-1854; Andrew Maguire, 1848-1871; Michael Harrington Ryan, 1853-1861. Not one of these threw in his lot with the diocese when the time arrived to make a decision. A few others had some short experience in the Penal Stations, having filled vacancies temporarily. Such were John Murphy, Charles Woods, Michael Burke, Edward Marum, Timothy Lucas, and George Hunter. These really belonged to the diocesan pastoral clergy labouring in Tasmania until called to their reward.

As the old order neared its end a new difficulty threatened to present itself. Scattered over a wide expanse of territory there would be

Catholic men outside the reach of their pastors and deprived of spiritual help. This thought sorely distressed the Bishop. For Protestants in a like category there were numerous churches towards the building of which public funds had been voted: there were also resident ministers maintained by the Colonial Treasury. With the Catholics it was otherwise. In the whole Island they had only three churches, and their clergy receiving a Government salary numbered but three in addition to the Bishop. In the past every effort to alter this situation had been unsuccessful: the future offered no better prospects. Dr. Willson, therefore, requested that consideration should be given by the Comptroller-General to the selection of a departmental Chaplain for New Norfolk in the interests of men not yet fully exempt from supervision:

"Hobart Town, 4th July, 1850.

"Sir,—I had the honour, the 19th ulto., to suggest to you the propriety, on the breaking up of the Station at Maria Island, that one of the Catholic Chaplains employed in your Department should be placed at New Norfolk, in order to render spiritual aid to those members of his Church capable of receiving it in the Hospital for the Insane, and also to itinerate the surrounding districts, and afford moral culture to passholders, and others, who are under the control of the Government.

"By letter the same date I was informed that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor had it not in his power to sanction such arrangement.

"I hope I may be excused for again bringing this subject under consideration as I believe it to be one of much consequence to the welfare of transported men, members of the Catholic Church, and I may say to Society at large.

"Before proceeding with the part of the subject which refers to men distributed over the Colony I beg permission to remark I do not think there is one well regulated house in England, of any magnitude, for the treatment of the insane, without having the benefit of religious services, and spiritual consolation administered by judicious clergymen. By no class of sufferers will the sweet and soothing effects of religion be more deeply felt than by some whom Almighty God is pleased to afflict with a malady of all others, perhaps, the most pitiable, to say nothing of the powerful aid that is sometimes afforded in effecting cures.

"At present persons, whether male or female, whilst under the immediate control of Government have the benefit of moral instruction by the attendance of Chaplains, use of books, etc., etc.—and members of both Churches alike participate in these blessings. The effect produced by this arrangement has been publicly acknowledged by Lord Stanley in Parliament, who stated, March 6, 1847, "it was a sin, and a shame to England, that until 1843, no provision had been made for moral instruction for transported persons—that in that year he had sent out some ministers of the Protestant Church, and some clergymen of the Roman Catholic, and that he believed their efforts had been of the greatest service"; and this opinion has been confirmed very strongly by the Right Honorable the present Secretary of State.

"That the prisoners when removed from the immediate superintendence of Government should have no means of obtaining moral culture, or next to none, or be left entirely without the spiritual guidance of a Pastor, I am sure, could never be intended; and therefore the Secretary of State did sanction the appointment of six Chaplains for the special object of watching over the prisoners who belonged to the Church of England, even before the breaking up of the Stations,

notwithstanding there were twenty-nine Churches in different parts of the island, for members belonging to that Church, supported from the Colonial Fund. Prisoners, then, belonging to the Church of England, when removed from Government Stations, have great advantages at once afforded them—advantages, I am sure, by no means too great. But permit me to contrast the scanty means afforded the prisoners of the other Church, when scattered over the Colony; at a time, too, they so much need spiritual encouragement, admonition, and care. For at present, first: there are no Chaplains employed by the Department for this purpose; and second: there are only three Churches in the whole Colony receiving aid from the public funds.

"From these facts it will be obvious that the Roman Catholic prisoners, from the moment they leave a Government Station, except those who live in Hobart or Launceston, and Richmond, are at once placed in a very disadvantageous position compared with their fellow prisoners of the other Church, and this fact I would beg leave respectfully, but urgently, to lay before the Government.

"And here I may be permitted to observe that although men are no longer sent hither for probation as it is termed, still large masses continue to arrive from time to time, as passholders, and holders of tickets-of-leave—and when that portion of them who may belong to the Roman Catholic Church are passed into the country, it is quite obvious that they must be nearly, and very many of them entirely, destitute of religious instruction and assistance—a state of things, I am sure, never contemplated by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State.

"Allow me also to state that during 1848 and 9 I did confidently anticipate that the Roman Catholic community would have received from the Colonial Funds very considerable additional aid towards the maintenance of clergymen and also towards the erection of Churches: but my hopes have not been realised. I also fully expected that as the penal Stations were broken up the Chaplains employed therein would be continued, I may say as a matter of course, to watch over the same class they had minister to, men and women, still prisoners of the Crown, until their services should be no longer needful.

"And to show that I had grounds for forming the expectation that additional accommodation would be afforded us by the Colony I will take leave to lay before you a brief statement of facts which influenced me in so doing.

"The wording of the Church Act of this Colony places on equality the Churches of England, Scotland, and Rome: but the subjoined table will show that to one of those Churches it is almost a dead letter.

"According to the last census the number of people belonging to the three Churches was as follows:

"Church of England ..... 44,490; having 29 churches;
"Church of Scotland ..... 4,552, having 10 churches;
"Church of Rome ..... 9,904, having 3 churches.

"Having shown, I trust satisfactorily, the propriety, nay, I shall venture to say, the justice of my request, I hope His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor will be so kind as to sanction it.

"I have the honour, etc.,
"+ R. W. WILLSON,
"Catholic Bishop of Hobart Town".

After some hesitation, the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir W. T. Denison, consented to the appointment of the Rev. W. Odillo Woolfrey to New Norfolk. The Secretary of State's approval came in due time. The Bishop next solicited Earl Grey's attention to the necessity of making further provision for Catholics liberated from the disbanded Stations as

well as for those arriving in the Colony—as they continued to do until 1853—with tickets-of-leave. This letter, dated 6th January, 1851, will serve to throw light on prevailing conditions:

"It has hitherto been Your Lordship's desire, and that of Lord Stanley when Secretary of State for the Colonies, that Roman Catholic prisoners should have a fair opportunity afforded of being instructed in morality by clergymen of their Church provided for by Her Majesty's Government. This circumstance is most gratifying, and I feel confident, one which has been, and by Almighty God's blessing, will continue to be productive of immense good to thousands both in this, and the neighbouring Colonies.

"The provision just referred to was applicable to the prisoners whilst serving their time of probation, or when detained at punishment stations. Under either circumstance, by this just and wise arrangement, Protestants and Roman Catholics enjoyed a perfect equality as to moral means of reformation.

"Permit me to point out how different their position is when they quit their Stations.

"As soon as they leave a probation or punishment Station whether male or female, or arrive in the Colony as they now do with passes, or tickets-of-leave, they then fall (with the exception of those who are waiting to be assigned as servants) to the care of the clergy, generally provided for from Colonial Funds.

"In the English Church there are in various parts of the Island 29 clergymen thus supported, having about 44,000 people to attend; who, with, I believe, six Chaplains provided for by Her Majesty's Government to itinerate for the benefit of prisoners holding tickets-of-leave or passes, afford a very fair opportunity to the prison population belonging to that Church to receive spiritual instruction.

"But how widely different is the position of Catholics when they leave the Government Stations or arrive in the Colony with tickets-of-leave or passes. In the whole Colony there are at present, only *three* Roman Catholic clergymen supported by the Colonial Fund, although there are about 10,000 people to watch over —and until lately, there was not one Chaplain maintained by Her Majesty's Government for the prison population; now there is one, the one formerly stationed at Maria Island; and he is employed in attending the Lunatic Asylum at New Norfolk, and in itinerating over a large District for the benefit of pass and ticket-of-leave holders.

"Though there has been a wise and humane desire for the moral culture of all men whilst in any of the Stations, no sooner are these persons scattered over the Colony than the Roman Catholics become almost totally neglected in comparison with members of the other Church, a fact of deep interest to the Colonists at large as well as to those who are in bondage; and I feel assured I need only point out this great evil to secure, if not a remedy, at least a speedy mitigation of it. I therefore suggest that not less than four more Chaplains should be appointed to itinerate and watch over the people referred to, and their families, as many of them are married and have children—and moreover that forage for a horse or a gratuity, should be allowed to Roman Catholic clergymen, not supported by Her Majesty's Government, who have frequently long journeys to take, in order to render assistance to this class of persons, who otherwise would be totally overlooked.

"The clergyman, I suggest should be employed in itinerating, etc., would have, with the permission of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, to render spiritual assistance in their respective districts, to a very important class of persons who have lately come to this Colony: I mean the pensioners and their families. From the statement I have made regarding the spiritual destitution of the Roman Catholics in the Colony at large, Your Lordship will perceive the great dearth of moral culture for pensioners and their families, a class of person who

should be zealously and carefully watched over by their pastors when they first settle in an Island filled with persons like those I have mentioned".

No answer was given to Bishop Willson's petition.[1]

(To be continued.)

JOHN H. CULLEN.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

IN THE FURROW OF THE CROSS (Mother Maria de la Virgen Dolorosa, Religious of the Society of Mary Reparatrix). Gill. 97 pages.

Two aspects of this small book make it worthy of a place among modern biographies. First, there is the astonishing life of reparation lived by this Spanish nun in our own century (she died in 1942); secondly, the matter-of-fact account of sufferings endured by nuns at the hands of the Communists during the Spanish Civil War of 1936.

The nuns of Marie Reparatrice do not seem to have suffered any physical violence during their imprisonment, though again and again, after regaining their freedom, they were seized anew and imprisoned in the infamous Cheka in Madrid. One night as Mother Maria was praying there in her cell with her three nun companions, she heard her name called out from the list of those who were to be shot on the morrow. Someone must have intervened on her behalf, for she was not called for as the silence of the dawn was broken by the creaking of bolts drawn back from the different cells as people were led out for execution.

Our nun, the Mother Superior, was at this time fifty-seven, living a humanly impossible life of physical pain. Spinal disease necessitated the continual wearing of a steel corset; also under habit and round her neck she wore a steel collar. Without this support her head would fall forward, her chin touching her chest. This went on for over thirty years. Other ailments accumulated during the years; and her triumph over her infirmities is an inspiring story. As for her inner life of oblation, of which we are permitted glimpses, some of us will wonder are we doing anything at all for God. And that is not a bad frame of mind in which to close a book.

M.O.

---

[1]Sources: *Gov. Records, Tas.*, 1844-1855; *Convict Correspondence,* 1844-1855. Letters to and from Bishop Willson.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS. III. THE MEANING OF SACRIFICE.

Preliminary Considerations.

The history of mankind is the history of an altar. Obedient to instincts that stirred and tormented the deepest depths of his restless soul, man has always stretched out to his God across the altar of sacrifice. From the East to the West, from the North to the South, the religious psychology of man opened, evolved, and came to rest in an atmosphere charged with the odour of sacrifice. There were rites that were strange, rites that were gracious, rites that were horrifying, rites that were splendid, rites simple and majestic, rites attractive and repulsive; but always there was sacrifice as man poured out his heart-burnings, his longings, and the mysterious movements of his soul amidst the blood and ashes of the victims of an altar. This fact alone persuades us that the offering of sacrifice is an exigency of human nature, an irresistible demand of the human heart that seeks its destiny. It is founded on a law of nature.

Once we have grasped the metaphysical condition of man as a creature of God it is not at all difficult to appreciate the all-important part that sacrifice plays in the life of religion. The condition of creaturehood gives rise, of necessity, to certain fundamental relations between creature and Creator. Not only did God draw man from the abyss of nothingness; not only does His omnipotent hand conserve man in every instant of his existence, lest he should fall back into a state of annihilation; but He directed man's intellectual nature towards Himself as the one Final End in which man can find beatitude, and, with divine liberality, bestows on him the apt and necessary means to achieve the goal of eternal destiny. Man, then, totally depends on God, his Creator, in his becoming, his being, his activities, his ultimate end, and the means for its attainment.

Now, as soon as man becomes conscious, however vaguely, of these radical relations to the Author of his being, there awakens in his heart a persuasion of the supreme excellence of God and a realization of a profound duty of acknowledging that supreme excellence, of giving honour to his Lord, and of bowing before Him in humble submission. Thus is born *Religion,* which is the bond that unites man with God in the embrace of friendship. But religion, like every virtue, whether

natural or supernatural, is something dynamic, an internal power which breaks forth into actions of intellect, will, and body. And this whole complex of activities constitutes the *cult, or worship,* of God.

Now, in this cycle of religious actions there must be found some one action which, of its very nature, expresses the supreme honour due to Almighty God and is reserved for Him alone. Do not His excellence and supereminent dignity infinitely exceed the dignity of all created beings? Then the law of nature dictates that there be reserved in His honour at least one sacred sign of recognition, so that the rendering of this homage to any other being would constitute a crime against the divine majesty.

At this point the Voice of God in the pages of revelation and the voice of all mankind, however primitive, unite to assure us that this unique action is, and always has been found in *the offering of sacrifice.*

Man, recognizing his obligations to the Divinity, or filled with the sense of guilt in his many lapses from probity, sought to meet his God through this supreme act of worship, and thus to enter into vital contact and union with his final end and, consequently, his true and lasting beatitude. St. Augustine, whose soul was so susceptible of religious movements and so perfect a depository of human instincts, clearly recognized this fundamental feature of sacrifice. He described it as an action performed by men "in order that we might adhere to God in holy fellowship, an action which leads us to that final Good, in which alone we can be truly happy".[1] Sacrifice is essentially an action by which man decisively ratifies his own position in the world of creation, proclaims his true worth in all its relativeness to One who is infinitely greater, seals his destiny by the greatest act of worship of which he is capable, and casts himself with complete abandonment into the arms of God, his beginning and his end, where, in complete surrender, he exhausts the powers of his soul in a mighty effort to become one with his Lord.

There is no action so dynamic, so filled with movement, so pregnant with meaning, as the supreme act of sacrifice. Since it is the vivid external expression of man's encounter with his God, of his complete surrender to his final end, and of established concord between the human and Divine wills, it cannot be otherwise.

The word *"sacrifice"* eloquently proclaims the basic psychological

[1] *De Civitate Dei,* bk. X, c. 6.

attitude of man, whether Christian, Jew, or pagan, as he stood and still stands at an altar of sacrifice. The word means *"to make a thing sacred"*. It means to perform an action over an object, thereby setting it aside from all profane use and rendering it sacred in the eyes of God and men. By renouncing his property, dedicating it to the service of the Divinity, and religiously transferring it to God, the Author of all things, man is conscious of performing a sacred action that imparts sacred worth to the object thus disposed of. The object makes contact with the Divinity, becomes a divine possession, and takes on something of Divinity.

This is precisely what man desires. Why? Because into the object thus sent forth man pours out his whole self, his feelings, his life, all the mysterious movements of his soul, completely identifying himself with the victim of his sacrifice. He speeds forth in this victim, now animated by his own self, in order to make contact and enter into union with his God. It is his ardent desire that his Lord will accept this offering as His own because then He will receive the offerer in the embrace of His friendship. The union thus effected is the joy of the soul, because it is the pledge and preparation of the great final union of unending beatitude.

In his mind, the real thing offered and immolated is not the victim on the altar but his own self, which gives life to the blood and fire to the ashes. The renunciation and surrender of his life in order to enter into the higher life of the Divinity, and receive from his God the assurance of His friendly protection and love—this was always the psychological attitude of man standing at the altar: "That we might adhere to God in holy fellowship." And it reached its climax on the altar of the Cross, where the Blood that poured forth was the terrible symbol of complete surrender, renunciation of self, wholehearted transference of Life to the Divinity.

This is the basic concept of sacrifice as we find it engraven on the consciousness of mankind. It is a concept bursting with life, because it portrays the vital movement of man's return to the Principle and Final End of his being. It was more fully appreciated by our ancient ancestors, who were closer to life than we are. To-day, theologians, with their cut and dried analysis of sacrifice as an external, ritual formalism, are so concerned with the blood that flows on the cold stones that they all but ignore the quickening spirit that breathes life and meaning into this sublime gesture by which man "makes a thing sacred", and identifies himself completely with it, and transfers himself

with it to the bosom of God in order to enjoy communion with Him. Only when this idea has been grasped may we proceed to a more scientific consideration of sacrifice.

THE ESSENCE OF SACRIFICE.

From our preliminary remarks it is easy to see that a sacrifice is an external act of worship which expresses the internal dispositions of the soul. A man sacrifices himself when he sacrifices his victim. His sacrifice has moral value, religious worth, in proportion to the dispositions which move his will and intellect. If those dispositions are lacking, he merely performs an empty, pharisaical rite when he stretches forth his hand to the victim. He makes a lie of his victim even as his victim makes a liar of him. St. Augustine perceived this very clearly when he said: "The visible sacrifice is the sacrament, that is the sacred sign, of the invisible sacrifice".[2] And St. Thomas followed him closely, writing: "The offering of sacrifice is made to signify something. That which is offered externally signifies the internal, spiritual sacrifice in which the soul offers itself to God".[3] The man at the altar pours forth his soul into his victim. If sacrifice does not mean this it means nothing.

Therefore, there are *two aspects of sacrifice.* There is the *physical aspect,* which is the external sacrifice, centred on the victim lying on the altar; and there is the *moral aspect,* which is the internal sacrifice, centred in the soul of man and striving to manifest itself in external signs. If we are to have an adequate idea of sacrifice we must consider each of these aspects and the relation of the one to the other. This we shall now attempt.

I. THE PHYSICAL COMPOSITION OF SACRIFICE.

Two essential elements concur to form the external, visible entity of sacrifice: a) *the oblation* of some sense-perceptible object; b) *the immolation,* or destruction, of the object which is thereby forfeited by man and placed beyond all profane use.

a) No one has ever denied that the *oblation of some sense-perceptible object* pertains to the essence of sacrific. The prince of philosophers clearly expresses this universal persuasion: "It proceeds from natural reason that man should use some sensible things, offering them to God as an expression of his humble submission and of the honour due to God, after the manner in which men offer things to their mast-

---

[2] *De Civitate Dei,* bk. 10, c. 5.
[3] *Summa Theol.,* 2-2, q. 85, a. 2.

ers in recognition of their lordship. *And this belongs to the nature of sacrifice*".[4]

Sacred scripture does not leave room for doubt on this point. All the sacrifices of the Old Law essentially embodied the oblation of some sense-perceptible object: Abel offered the first-fruits of his flock; Cain made an oblation of the fruits of the soil; Noe, coming forth from the ark, offered holocausts on the altar; Melchisedech offered bread and wine; Abraham, in conformity with the Divine command, offered his son, Isaac; and the Levites were frequently commanded by God to offer the blood of victims.[5]

Even apart from the Old Testament, we have the authority of Our Lord: "If therefore thou offer thy gift at the altar, and there thou remember that thy brother hath anything against thee, leave there thy offering before the altar and go first to be reconciled to thy brother: and then coming thou shalt offer thy gift".[6]

The history of religions also proclaims this truth. In the concept of sacrifice as found in all peoples, pagans included, the oblation of some sense-perceptible thing is considered as an essential element. In fact this act of oblation is the stable element which links together bloody and unbloody sacrifices on the altars of mankind.[7]

Now, some theologians are so taken up with the consideration of the act of oblation that they do not hesitate to affirm that it is not only *one essential element of sacrifice* but that it is that element which *formally constitutes the sacrifice in its physical entity.* They would maintain that the oblation of the object is the *specific form* of sacrifice, that which intrinsically constitutes it, after the manner in which the human soul is the specific form in the constitution of man. This teaching has been recently propounded, and greatly popularized by such theologians as de la Taille, in his monumental work, "Mysterium Fidei",[8] Lepin,[9] and Bishop A. MacDonald,[10] to mention but a few. And many have accepted it without question.

It is quite evident that the oblation of a sensible object alone does not constitute a sacrifice. We did not need an Aquinas to point out to us that "every sacrifice is an oblation, but not every oblation is a sacri-

---

4*Summa Theol.*, 2-2, 85, 1.
5*Genesis*, 4, 3-4; *Ibid.*, 8, 20; *Ibid.*, 14, 18; *Ibid.*, 22, 2; *Leviticus*, 1-7.
6*Mt.*, 5, 23-24; cf. *Mt.*, 8, 4; *Hebrews*, 6, 1.
7Cf. M. J. Lagrange, *Etudes sur les Religions Sémitiques*, Paris, 1903, p. 249.
8*Elucidatio* 1.
9*l'idée du Sacrifice de la Messe....*, Paris, 1926.
10*The Sacrifice of the Mass*, London, 1924.

fice",[11] though, undoubtedly, many would not have believed this had not the Angelic Doctor taken pains to mention it more than once. We must readily see, with St. Thomas, that the act of oblation is *a generic, indeterminate action;* it is common to many things. If a person makes an oblation of an object, deputing it to the cult of God, but in such a way that the object remains whole and unchanged, then it is truly an oblation, but it is certainly not a sacrifice. But if the object is offered and burned upon the altar then it is an oblation and a sacrifice.[12] Thus, "an oblation is directly so called when something is offered to God, even though nothing is done with it; just as money or bread are said to be offered on the altar, nothing being done with them. And so, every sacrifice is an oblation; but the converse is not true".[13]

Similarly, *oblations,* like other acts of cult, such as genuflections and like expressions of honour, are directed towards men as well as towards God, "but no one ever judged that *a sacrifice* should be offered to a person unless he believed that person to be God, or pretended to believe so".[14]

We repeat that the act of oblation is, in itself, a generic, indeterminate thing that can be common to many things. What, then, is the other element which constitutes a sacrifice in its specific being and distinguishes it from simple oblation? Whatever that other essential element may be, it is the determining form which specifies the oblation *in ratione sacrificii.* In other words, it must be considered as *the formal constituent of sacrifice.* The question is one of tremendous importance because of its bearing on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. If sacrifice in general is intrinsically and formally constituted by an element called X, then the Mass will bear a sacrificial character precisely because that element called X is verified therein. What, then, is this other element which draws the sacred rite from the genus of oblation and determinedly constitutes it a true sacrifice?

It is quite absurd to proceed by an a priori method in this matter. Among all the external actions of which man is capable there is none which, of itself, can adequately signify the honour which is due to God. Therefore, we are not justified in judging abstractly that this or that element specifically constitutes the supreme act of worship, which is sacrifice. The only sane way of arriving at a conclusion is the

---

[11] *In Psalm.* 34, 4; cf. *Summa Theol.,* 2-2, 85, 3, ad 3.
[12] *Summa Theol.,* 2-2, 86, 1.
[13] *Ibid.,* 2-2, 85, 3, ad 3.
[14] *Contra Gentes,* bk. 3, c. 120.

a posteriori method. Let us study the sacrifices which *God Himself* either commanded explicitly to be offered or manifestly accepted; for in this, as in all such matters, it is far better to fall into the hands of God than into those of men!

b) *Immolation.*

Now, a close scrutiny of those sacrifices by which God willed to be honoured yields up this conclusion: *Immolation, that is, the destruction of the thing offered, is the specific element by which a true sacrifice is distinguished from all other oblations.* In all the sacrifices of the Old Law we observe some real destruction of the thing offered. In the greater sacrifices—those performed by shedding blood—the victim was killed and consumed by fire, while in the lesser ones—the unbloody sacrifices—food and drink, were likewise destroyed, either by fire or by being poured out on the ground. Moreover, it is instructive to note that a sacrifice was considered to be the more perfect in proportion to the destruction of the thing offered, the most perfect sacrifice of all being the holocaust, in which the thing offered was totally destroyed.

There is no need to quote numerous passages of Scripture in proof of this truth. It is evident to all who have even a minimum acquaintance with the Old Testament. When Noe came forth to offer sacrifice he knew what he had to do if his action was to be worthy of the name: "Noe built an altar unto the Lord: and taking of all cattle and fowls that were clean, offered *holocausts* upon the altar. And the Lord *smelled the sweet savour,* and said: I will no more curse the earth for the sake of man".[15]

When God commanded Abraham thus: "Take thy only-begotten son, Isaac . . . . and offer him for a holocaust upon one of the mountains which I will show thee", Abraham was in no doubt as to what he must do. If he had *to sacrifice* his son, he could not do so by merely *making an oblation* of him on the altar, even if he were then to give him irrevocably into the service of God. No! immediately "he built an altar.... and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar....and he put forth his hand and *took the sword, to sacrifice his son*".[16]

God Himself ordered the Levites to offer the legal sacrifices by immolating the victims: "And he shall immolate the calf before the Lord: and the priests, the sons of Aaron, shall offer the blood thereof, pouring it round about the altar....And they shall put fire on the altar

[15] *Genesis,* 8, 20-21.
[16] *Ibid.,* 22, 9-10.

....and the priests shall burn them (the victims) upon the altar for a holocaust, and a sweet savour to the Lord".[17] We should also note that the word "obtulit", offered, which is frequently used in the Old Testament to describe the action of sacrificing, is not to be understood in the simple, restricted sense of "making an oblation", but in the full sacrificial sense of "immolating the thing offered". This is the common usage of the term in Sacred Scripture. Thus, e.g., when it is said that Abel "offered of the firstlings of his flock", we must not conclude that he merely made *an oblation* of them and then set them apart from profane use. We must understand that he truly *sacrificed* them, that is, that he *immolated* them. The text itself gives us this understanding, informing us that Abel "offered of the firstlings of his flock, *and of their fat*".

Let us not, then, be deceived by those theologians, who strive to remove the idea of immolation from sacrifice, when they indulge in such passionate appeals as this: "Our God is the God of the living, not of the dead. He is the protector and conserver of His Creation, the Author of life, not an angel of extermination. Is it conceivable that God should find pleasure in the destruction of his gifts? Shall the Giver of life be honoured by the outpourings of blood and the pungent odours of burning flesh?"

Such expressions of sentimental fancy are meaningless when confronted with the emphatic teachings of Sacred Scripture. They are even amusing, because harmless in themselves. But they are not worthy of theologians, and are calculated to do great harm to the souls of the less-instructed. It is far better to fall into the hands of the Living God. God Himself established the law of sacrifice in great detail in the days of Moses and Aaron, and He gave strict instructions that the thing offered should, in every case, be immolated. (cf. *Leviticus,* ch. 1-5.)

It is true, as these theologians know only too well, that God did not require, or take any pleasure in, the destruction of victims as such. Nor did the sacrifices of His people in any way imply this. The external sacrifice is *a sign,* "the sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice" by which a man surrenders and completely dedicates his life to God. God was well pleased with the pouring-out of the victim's blood *because of what it signified*: the consecration and total submission of man's heart to God, the Author of being. As such the immolation of sacrifice was acceptable to God. It was only when man made a liar of his victim, immolat-

[17] *Leviticus,* Chapters 3-5.

ing externally while his heart was a sepulchre of arrant hypocrisy that Jahve exclaimed in anger: "I have no pleasure in you, and I will not receive a gift of your hand".[18]

We do not see, then, how we can, with a good conscience, escape this conclusion: Sacred Scripture teaches us that immolation of the victim is not only *an essential element of sacrifice,* but that immolation is the element which *formally constitutes* a sacrifice. Immolation of the victim, when united to oblation, removes the generic indeterminateness of oblation and, as the Scholastics would say, specifically constitutes it *in ratione veri sacrificii.*

At this point, let us recall what prompts man to offer sacrifice at all. Is it not his desire to express, by some external act of cult, his acknowledgement of the super-eminent dignity and supreme dominion of God, and his own total submission and consecration to the Author of his life and the Final End of his existence? The question is, then: how shall he externally express this disposition of soul in the best possible manner? Surely the complete renunciation of self is then best expressed when the victim, with which the offerer identifies himself, is completely alienated from the offerer, totally renounced, and transferred, as a sacred thing, to the Divinity. Now, this is effected by *the immolation of the victim,* not by an act of oblation. That is why the Jews were convinced, at the dictation of Jahve, that the more destruction that could be wrought on the victim so much the more perfect was the sacrifice, because it was so much the more expressive of the internal sacrifice of one's own life to God. The offerer poured out his life and all the movements of his soul into his victim, and when he shed its blood (which is the symbol and index of life) he vividly expressed the giving up of his whole being to God, his Creator and Lord. Only by some immolation, then, is the supreme power and dominion of God aptly signified. Without some immolation of the thing offered, we do not see how there can be verified in sacrifice that particular power and aptness to signify what a sacrifice, of its very nature, is meant to signify. Hence we conclude that *some immolation of the thing offered must be said to be the formal constituent element of sacrifice.* Thus human reason gives rational assent to what Sacred Scripture suggests.[19]

---

[18] *Malachias,* 1, 10.

[19] All this is predominantly evident where a sacrifice of propitiation for sins is offered. By sinning, man completely turns away from God, his sovereign Lord and Final End. In consequence he is deserving of punishment in a certain sense infinite, because the injury and insult of sin against God's infinite majesty are in a certain sense infinite. Wishing, then, to make reparation, man endeav-

If we contemplate for one moment the most perfect sacrifice ever offered, that of *Calvary,* we shall see that it was formally constituted by the bloody immolation of the Victim on the altar of the Cross. Christ, Our Lord, received from His Father a strict command to offer Himself in sacrifice. His whole life on earth was a continual *oblation* of Himself, but it was not a true sacrifice. His life was given in *sacrifice* when it was taken from him by death; *immolation* was the formal constituent of His sacrifice. In fact, the Father received no action of Christ's life as meritorious in His sight apart from its relation to that supreme act of immolation on the Cross. From this we gather that in the eyes of God—and therefore in very truth—an oblation becomes a true sacrifice only when the victim is in some way immolated.

If you consult the *religious history of mankind* you will find this common persuasion, that the mere oblation of a thing to the Divinity is not the formal constituent of sacrifice. Mankind has always insisted on the immolation of victims whenever the idea of sacrifice presented itself. That has always been the predominant characteristic of sacrifice in the mind and actions of man in every age. It is a conviction of human nature; and it passed into the daily language of the peoples of the earth, for, the things offered were described in terms which express the idea of immolation or some painful mutation; e.g., the word *"hostia",* a victim, is derived from *"hostio",* meaning "to strike down", which, in turn comes from *"ferio",* meaning "to slay". The religious sense of mankind assures us, with St. Thomas, that every sacrifice *contains* an oblation, but that the oblation is not the essential element which *specifically constitutes* a sacrifice; to the act of oblation, or dedication to the cult of God, there must be added the immolation of the victim; and according as this specifying element is present or absent you have sacrifice or mere oblation.

The Angelic Doctor, speaking of sacrifice in general, states that if something is offered to the worship of God in such a way that it remains whole and entire (integrum), then we have an oblation but not a sacrifice. On the other hand, if something is offered and is destroyed,

---

ours to express his unworthiness to stand in the sight of his offended God: he is willing to lay down his life for his sins. However, he does not possess dominion over his own life; so he chooses a vicarious victim to sacrifice to his God. Now, unless he *immolates* this victim he does not sufficiently express and symbolize his internal disposition of soul. Even Fr. de la Taille is forced to admit this: in Elucidatio I, p. 10, of "Mysterium Fidei" he writes: "Where the principal end of sacrifice is propitiatory, some destruction or slaying of the victim seems more fitting."—Nevertheless, what we have said is verified also in sacrifices where the chief end is not propitiatory but latreutic or eucharistic.

i.e., immolated, then we have an oblation and a sacrifice.[20] In other words, *take away the immolation and there remains a mere oblation, for you take away sacrifice; add the immolation, and you change the mere oblation into a true sacrifice.* What does this mean? It means only one thing: immolation is the specific form which constitutes a true sacrifice.

We conclude, then, that sacrifice in general, considered in its *physical* make-up, is composed of *two essential elements*, namely, *oblation and immolation*; and of these two, oblation must be considered as the indeterminate, generic element, whereas immolation is the specific form which intrinsically constitutes a sacrifice in its formal entity.

We do not see how we can avoid this conclusion. If we could escape it we would willingly do so, because it gives rise to certain difficulties when applied to the Sacrifice of the Mass. But difficulties are inseparable from mysteries; and the Sacrifice of the Mass is no small mystery. The opposite opinion, advanced by a few modern theologians (Lepin, de la Taille, J. Grivet, Batiffol, J. Rivière, A. Gaudel....) and holding that a sacrifice consists in a simple oblation, no immolation being essentially required, is undoubtedly easier and, therefore, more convenient when applied to the Mass. But what is easier and more convenient is not necessarily true, particularly when one is dealing with God's mysteries. So it is in the present instance.

c) WHAT IMMOLATION IS REQUIRED?

It is very important to have a clear answer to this question. *The victim must be placed in a state of immolation*; that is the primary essential of sacrifice. Now, it is evident that immolation cannot be verified in exactly the same way in all types of sacrifice. The governing principle, to be thoroughly grasped, is this: *immolation will differ according to the different nature and condition of the victim to be immolated.* This is only logical; one can't get blood from a stone.

Firstly, if the victim is present in its natural condition—or, as the theologians say, *in specie propria*—as in the sacrifices of the Old Law and the sacrifice of the Cross, the immolation will be *physical,* brought about by slaying the victim. If the victim happens to be a non-living thing it will be placed in a state of immolation by being burned. Thus it is equivalently immolated.

Secondly, if the victim is not externally present in its natural form

---

[20] 2-2, 86, 1. We confess that St. Thomas' thoughts are not always clearly expressed on this point; it is very difficult to get at his true mentality; but the passage referred to leaves little room for doubt. Cf. Lepin, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

and condition, but under the form and appearances of something else, —or, as the theologians say, *in specie aliena*,—then it is *sacramentally* present, present under the visible signs or appearances. Now, since the type of immolation is governed by the condition of the victim, it follows logically that in this case we shall have a *sacramental immolation*. In such a case, external immolation of the victim is possible only in so far as *the victim is effectively represented, by means of the external signs, in a state of death.*

When the victim is sacramentally present, as Christ is in the Eucharist, the only sacrifice possible is a *sacramental sacrifice*. The act of immolation, falling upon the victim, strikes the victim in accordance with its state of being present, and immolates the victim accordingly. If it is sacramentally present, it will be sacramentally immolated. The body will be separated from the blood *sacramentally*, that is, as they are *contained and represented by the external signs or appearances under which the victim is present.*

Since the Mass is a sacramental sacrifice, because of the sacramental condition of the Victim, the only immolation possible is the sacramental immolation. But we do not wish to anticipate this question; at present we are endeavouring to arrive at the true notion of sacrifice in general.

II. THE MORAL ASPECT OF SACRIFICE.

The whole external rite of sacrifice, as we have striven to explain it, is an efficacious expression of the internal immolation and oblation of self. It is a vivid manifestation of man's sincere will and effort at self-renunciation. In the eloquence of the sacrificial rite he endeavours to express his acknowledgement of God's supreme excellence and sovereignty, and his total submission and dedication to his Lord. He strives to show that his whole being is a victim of praise, propitiation, and gratitude at the feet of his God.

This internal sacrifice of self is the soul which gives life to the whole external rite; it imparts to the external sacrifice all its moral value; it makes of it a sublime act of religion. Without this sacrifice of self the external sacrifice, no matter how majestic or moving it may be, is a mere corpse; and, morally speaking, an abominable act of hypocrisy in the eyes of God upon Whom it heaps insults and contempt. If the visible sacrifice is not "the sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice", it is a lie. It is the most terrible kind of lie because it perverts the supreme act of worship. Nothing is so sublime as the action of the man who pours out his whole life into his victim; and nothing is so repulsive as

the action of one who immolates with his hands while he adores his own ego. What is meant by nature to be a sign of union and submission becomes an occasion of aversion and rebellion.

It is precisely because the external sacrifice draws all its moral value from the internal sacrifice that St. Thomas sometimes calls the latter *"the true sacrifice"*. The external sacrifice, he writes, "is representative of the internal, the true sacrifice in which the human soul offers itself to God. It offers itself to God, as to the Principle of its being, the Author of its operations, and the Final End wherein lies its beatitude".[21]

On the other hand, the dispositions of soul in one who offers sacrifice are greatly increased by the external actions of oblation and immolation. These are a powerful stimulus to the soul, urging it to imitate more perfectly that which is being done to the victim: *imitamini quod tractatis,* and so give itself totally to God Almighty.[22] Thus the two aspects of sacrifice, the physical-external and the moral-internal, are strictly related in this mutual interchange of strength and significance.

N.B.—From all that has been said on the twofold aspect of sacrifice, there leaps forth a conclusion which will have great bearing on the Mass. It is this: where the victim of sacrifice is a rational being who offers himself (as in the Mass), the voluntary oblation and immolation of himself must be sufficiently expressed by the external rite; the external state of the victim must correspond with the internal state of voluntary immolation. Otherwise there is no sacrifice in the true sense of the word.

DEFINITION OF SACRIFICE.

We are now in a position to formulate our findings into a definition of a sacrifice in general. *Sacrifice is the supreme act of worship in which there is offered to God some sense-perceptible object which is placed in a state of immolation, in order to signify externally the internal dispositions of soul by which man acknowledges the infinite excellence of God and proclaims his total submission to Him.*

THE ENDS OF SACRIFICE.

The specific and primary end of sacrifice is the honour due to God and reserved for Him alone, namely, adoration, by which we praise His infinite goodness and bow down before Him. This is called the *latreutic end* of sacrifice.

---

[21] *Contra Gentes,* 3, 120.
[22] *Ibid.,* 3, 119.

But it is scarcely possible to contemplate God's infinite perfection without, at the same time, considering the bountiful blessings He has bestowed on us with so much gracious liberality. Hence we are bound to give thanks for these benefits unceasingly received. This is called the *eucharistic end* of sacrifice.

Vividly conscious of our total dependance on God as regards our whole existence and our activities, we are moved humbly to beg of Him blessings and graces to enrich our lives in the present and in the future. And this is termed the *impetratory end* of sacrifice.

Finally, the accusing voice of conscience tells us that by our sins we have outraged God's infinite goodness and majesty, and impels us to make due reparation and humbly implore forgiveness. And this is styled the *propitiatory end* of sacrifice. Needless to say, in our unhappy state of fallen nature every sacrifice offered is, if not primarily, then to a certain extent, propitiatory.

We have briefly outlined the four ends of sacrifice roughly according to the psychology of man; but it is evident that any one particular end may predominate in a particular sacrifice, in accordance with the dispositions and intention of the offerer.

If God be pleased to accept the sacrifice, the cause is won. Man ascended to God, through and in his victim, in a sublime gesture pregnant with the noblest aspirations of the human soul. God, in return, descends to man, through and in His gifts, in a divine gesture worthy of Infinite Love. Thus, in this sacrificial act, so charged with religious dynamism, the two are made one—the human and the Divine—on the altar of sacrifice.

These things are written in order that we might with better understanding approach the Great Christian Sacrifice.

THOMAS MULDOON.

Moral Theology

PLACE FOR HEARING SUNDAY MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A Priest who has an indult to say Mass on a portable Altar avails of his privilege to celebrate on a certain Sunday in a private house. Would the persons who assisted at that Mass fulfil their obligation or would they be bound to attend another Mass celebrated in one of the places mentioned in can. 1249?

ANXIOUS.

REPLY.

We are of opinion that the answer to this question depends on the purpose for which Mass is allowed on the portable altar, outside a church or oratory. If the reason which impelled the ecclesiastical Superior to grant the permission is the convenience of the faithful in a certain locality, or has some relation to the general good, then all who are present at the Mass fulfil their Sunday obligation. On the other hand, if the permission for Mass is granted solely for the benefit of the Priest or of a private individual or family, those persons and the server of the Mass, but no others, would satisfy the precept of hearing Mass.

It is likely enough that the members of the faithful who heard Mass on Sunday, no matter where it was celebrated, would be satisfied that they had done all that the Church required of them: they had been to Mass. Such a frame of mind, due to ignorance of a point in Law which is not generally referred to in popular manuals of instruction, would no doubt excuse them from formal sin should they not also hear a Mass offered in one of the places prescribed.

The question, however, is: does this popular conviction square with the positive Ecclesiastical Law? The Church not only prescribes attendance at Mass on Sundays and days of Precept; she also lays down the places wherein the Mass must be heard. Formerly, the people were obliged to hear Mass in their parish church. Pope Sixtus IV. (1471-1484) held that it was provided in Law that the parishioners must hear Mass in their own parochial churches, unless there were a genuine reason why they should be excused; and he forbade the Mendicant Friars to teach the people the contrary.[1] Custom, however, and the decrees of subsequent Popes,[2] mitigated the strictness of this law,

[1] *Extrav. 2 inter communes. De treuga et pace.*
[2] v.g., Leo X., litt. ap. *Intellexímus,* 13 *Nov.,* 1517.

especially in favour of the churches of the Regulars. The Council of Trent (Session XXII) decreed: "(The local Ordinaries) shall also admonish their people to go frequently to their own parish churches, at least on Sundays and the greater feasts." What was once an obligation had become a matter of counsel. The present legislation is contained in can. 1249: One satisfies the law of hearing Mass by assisting at Mass celebrated in any Catholic Rite, either in the open air or in any church, public or semi-public oratory, and in the private mortuary oratories in cemeteries spoken of in can. 1190, but not in other private oratories, unless ths privilege has been granted by the Holy See. Private oratories are thus expressly excluded, though one class is brought into the category of places where Mass may be heard for the purposes of the Sunday obligation—private oratories in cemeteries—and there is provision made for privileges which may be granted. The private oratories of Bishops and Cardinals are privileged by law, since they enjoy all the rights, etc., of semi-public oratories (can. 1189); and the Mass celebrated by a Protnotary Apostolic de numero Participantium in a private oratory will suffice to fulfil the precept of hearing Mass on Sundays and Feasts (Pius X. *Inter multiplices,* 21st Feb., 1905). When a person or family is granted the right of a private oratory, the Rescript will give in detail the persons who may satisfy their Sunday obligation by hearing Mass celebrated therein.

The canon just cited (1249) has reference to only one case of Mass said outside a place which is set apart exclusively for divine worship; and that is the case of Mass in the open air. In this instance, the altar would be a portable one; and all who are present at the Mass fulfil their Sunday obligation. What is to be said of Mass said on a portable altar, under the roof of a hall or private house? Can the expression of the canon *sub dio* include all Masses celebrated outside a church or oratory? There is some weight for the opinion advanced cautiously by Coronata[3] that it does. His reason briefly is that Mass may be heard in accordance with the ecclesiastical precept unless the place is expressly excluded by law. The Code, however, does not exclude Masses said on portable altars, but only those which are celebrated in private oratories. We do not see that this reasoning is convincing, and rather think that the law does implicitly exclude Mass said on a portable altar elsewhere than in the open. It seems to ennumerate the places where Mass may be heard and does not include Mass on a portable altar, except in one

[3]De Locis et Temporibus Sacris (1922), p. 294.

instance—when it is said in the open. It is worthy of note that a Mass said in the open would scarcely be for the convenience of the celebrant but for the benefit of the people. The Ordinary, by virtue of can. 822, p. 4, may grant permission for Mass outside a church or oratory for a just and reasonable cause, in extraordinary circumstances and *per modum actus*. If there be no church to accommodate the people, or because of some unusual assembly, Mass is said with the permission of the ordinary in some house or hall, there seems to be reason to assert that all who are present satisfy their Sunday obligation; for it is precisely to allow them to hear Mass that the permission is given, and it would be a strange disposition of law to allow Mass and at the same time leave those who attended it *per se* obliged to hear another Mass. In Missionary Countries the Bishops and other Ordinaries usually have more extensive faculties to permit the celebration of Mass outside a church or oratory. These faculties are given because of the circumstances which obtain in places where the Church is not yet fully established, and there can be little doubt that they are meant for the benefit of the faithful. Hence a Mass said by a Priest who used his missionary faculty to celebrate in a house on Sunday, would, we feel sure, be sufficient to satisfy the obligation of all who assisted at it. The Australasian Bishops enjoy the Faculty from the S. Congregation of Propaganda: *permittendi ut Missa celebrari possit super altari portatili,* and we think it a fair presumption that when the Ordinary gives a Priest permission to celebrate on a portable altar, His Lordship intends the maximum of benefit to accrue to the Church and souls from the concession. Accordingly, we would say that unless it is evident that the permission to say Mass in a house is intended merely for the convenience of the Priest, v.g., because he is sick or in feeble health and cannot go to a church, etc., to say his Mass, the faithful who are present fulfil their obligation on Sundays and days of Precept and cannot be held bound to go to another Mass.

This conclusion squares with the principle which seems to underlie the prescriptions of can. 1249. Mass said in a strictly private oratory is of no avail for the fulfilment of the Sunday precept, except for the private persons or individuals in whose favour the oratory is erected; but Mass celebrated in a place to which all the faithful have access (a church, a public oratory, an oratory in a cemetery, or in the open), or at least is for the benefit of a community (a semi-public oratory) will be sufficient for the purpose of hearing Mass on Sundays. So it is reasonable to hold that Mass said on a portable altar with due ecclesiastical

permission will satisfy the obligation of all who hear it, if it is permitted for a reason which has in view the public good; while if the Mass is allowed for a private reason it avails only those who were in the intention of the Superior who granted the permission.

In the foregoing remarks, we have spoken of Mass celebrated by a Priest. Should the celebrant of the Mass be a Bishop, or if the Mass is said by a Priest for the convenience of a Bishop, all who are present satisfy their Sunday obligation.

* * * *

STERILITY TESTS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. I understand that the members of the medical profession are satisfied that in many cases of childless marriages, conception does not take place because of some defect in the semen of the husband, and further, that experience shows, sometimes at least, the defect can be remedied. Would the husband of a childless marriage be justified in providing a specimen of the semen for appropriate tests and examination?

2. A young Catholic Doctor is an assistant at a clinic where such tests are carried out. He is convinced that the methods employed to obtain the specimens are not always in accord with Catholic moral teaching. Can he carry out the examination of specimens which have been obtained in an unlawful manner? And in the absence of his chief, may he ask the patient to provide a specimen and at the same time instruct him how to obtain it by means which are unlawful? If he does not, there is reason to believe that he will be considered unsuitable for the position, and will thus lose an opportunity to specialise in an important branch of medicine.

HAERENS.

REPLY.

1. It is true that in childless marriages the defect is not always attributable to the woman. Sterility can also affect the male; and unless both parties are free from it, conception will not follow the use of the marriage. Male sterility can frequently be traced to some defect in the semen, v.g., the spermatozoa are inactive or lose their vitality before they can reach their destination. There can be other causes also of male sterility. But whatever the cause, the medical adviser would want a proper diagnosis of the case before prescribing treatment with a view to a cure. If the diagnosis demands an examination of the semen, there is *per se* no objection to the examination. Just as the other

secretions of the human body may provide an indication of the presence of some disease, so the semen when examined may possibly explain the reason of sterility.

With regard to the method of obtaining the specimen, there is a pertinent answer of the Holy Office. The question was put: Whether masturbation directly procured was lawful in order to detect scientifically and as far as possible to cure the contagious disease known as *blenorragia* (gonorrhea)? The answer was: No. (A.A.S., 1929, p. 490). The question of the particular disease to be treated is, as we shall see, immaterial. It is definitely immoral directly to procure masturbation in order to have a specimen of the semen, for any purpose whatsoever.

There is little danger of violating the moral law in obtaining specimens of the usual matters which are required for laboratory tests. In themselves they are either waste products of the body, or, if they have a useful function, there is no difficulty in allowing them to be sacrificed for the general well-being of the patient. Further, they are obtained by the elimination of nature in the ordinary manner, or are taken from the body without the calling into operation a faculty that does not exist and function primarily for the good of the whole body.

Can the semen be regarded as portion of the human body which it is lawful to sacrifice? Can the sexual faculty be brought lawfully into operation in order to give the semen? From the answer to these two questions we hope the reason will appear for the decision of the Holy Office quoted above, and for the teaching of the Church[4] to which all theologians subscribe: that masturbation directly voluntary is essentially evil and can be justified under no circumstances.

a) The semen is a product of the body of the human male. Until such time as it is emitted, it remains under his limited dominion in the same manner as the other parts of his physical make-up. If it were necessary to have a specimen, and the operation of extracting it were feasable, we see no reason why it could be objected to on moral grounds, provided the sexual faculty was not brought into activity. (The reason for this proviso will appear under the next section.) The emission of the semen by means of the sexual organs implies that it is no longer part of the body of him in whom it was evolved; its natural exigency now is no other than to be united with the female ovum; and unless this happens or can happen in so far as human agency has any control, there

[4]Cf. S. Officium. 2 Martii, 1679. D. 1199.

is a perversion of nature. The semen in the act of emission does not exist for the benefit of the person to whom it belonged; its purpose is to become an instrument of procreation by union with the female ovum according to the natural manner of copulation. St. Thomas (De Malo, q. 15, a. 2) quotes Aristotle, who affirms that in the human seed there is something divine, because it is a man in potency. *Propinquius autem ordinatur ad vitam hominis semen humanum, in quo-est homo in potentia, quam quaecumquae res externae.* As long as the semen can be considered as a man in proximate potency (St. Thomas, *ibid.*) it cannot lawfully be subjected to any interference which would destroy its essential exigency, which, as we have said, is union with the female element of generation, to bring about the conception of a new member of the human family. The semen is rightly to be considered as a man *in potentia* as long as it can be placed by a vital act within the vagina of the woman. If it has once passed from the male, voluntarily or involuntary, and has not been placed by the same act within the body of the female, it ceases to be a man *in potentia.* There may or there may not have been a violation of the moral law in the case, but the capacity of the semen to become a human being is now ceased, and as it is now no longer anything but a waste product of the body it can be used for purposes of test and examination if needed. There was a violation of the moral law if the capacity of the semen in its passing from the male body was directly frustrated, for such an act is an interference with the principles of the beginnings of human life and has been described as *quasi homicidium anticipatum* (*anteceptum ac praecipitatum*).[5] It is a mortal sin *ex suo genere* (S. Thomas, loc. cit.). Consequently, to procure a specimen of the human semen by directly procured masturbation is something intrinsically evil, and cannot be justified by any intentions, however good, even though they be the eventual removal of sterility. The same may be said of any attempt surrounding the act of copulation which would prevent the passage of the semen to its proper destination.

This aspect of the malice of acts of lust contrary to nature (*contra naturam*) is not always stressed. In fact, its force is questioned for the following reasons: i) Nature herself frequently frustrates what we have maintained was the essential purpose of the semen as it left the male body, as happens in spontaneous emissions which occur at times during sleep; and ii) Married people are permitted to have conjugal relations, even when they know that one or other of them is perma-

[5]Franciscus Ter Haar, C.SS.R. Casus Conscientiae, Vol. II, p. 106.

nently or temporarily sterile. In these cases, the semen is *de facto* frustrated, and when conjugal relations take place during sterility, the parties know that conception will not and cannot result. Nevertheless, this knowledge of the frustration of the semen which will follow their deliberate act does not make it sinful for them to exercise their marriage rights. The conclusion drawn would be that the frustration of the semen, a thing that happens naturally and can also result from a lawful human action, can hardly be described as intrinsically evil. Authors who argue thus agree that sins of lust are indeed intrinsically evil, though they advance other and cogent arguments to defend the same thesis.

We would observe, however, with regard to the first argument that because certain things happen in the course of nature and by the Will of God Who is the Author of nature, it does not follow that created agents may lawfully bring them about. Man's dominion over created things is limited by the higher dominion of God. It is the law of nature that men should die; but murder remains intrinsically evil. So, if in the course of the workings of the ordinary laws of nature, the semen is at times emitted, the conclusion does not stand that man, who has no authority over the things that pertain to the essentials of human existence, can directly cause their frustration and destruction. In the second instance, married people lawfully exercise their rights; the frustration of the semen is again the work of nature. All that man can do is to perform the conjugal act in such a way that it is *per se aptus ad generandum*. The actual conception or failure of conception is not a human act, but an *actus naturae,* which is not ascribed to human agency as a cause.

b) The second question which we asked was: Can the sexual faculty lawfully be brought into operation in order to procure a specimen of the semen for medical purposes? God created the distinction of the sexes that one might complete the other in the work of procreation. *Erunt duo in carne una.* To use the sexual faculty for any other purpose than for an act which is in itself apt to generate offspring is to divert it from the function for which it was made, and is a grave abuse of an important human faculty. And so, we have only to put the question to answer it in the negative.[6]

---

[6]Fr. Vermeersch, *Theologia Moralis*, Tom. IV. p. 85, finds in this consideration the essential malice of pollution. Pollutio voluntaria substantialem continet violationem ordinis essentialis, cum vir vel mulier qui se polluunt exerceant qua *singuli* actum qui communi opera ut actus speciei exercendus erat.

To reiterate: Directly to procure masturbation is a mortal sin *ex toto genere suo*; it admits of no exceptions. The same is true of any attempt to prevent the natural result of the conjugal act. It is not the examination of the semen which is sinful, but some means of obtaining the specimen are so. Nature is prodigal in her ways; and there is no objection to obtaining a specimen on those occasions when the semen is emitted involuntarily, or indeed voluntarily in the lawful conjugal act, but in such a way that the natural efficiency of the act is not impeded.

2. We think the Catholic Doctor may make the examination of the specimen without enquiring whence or how it was obtained; provided of course his action is not likely to be accepted as approval of what was sinful.

He may not advise sinful methods of obtaining the specimens he desires. To do so would be to co-operate in an act which is intrinsically evil and could be excused on no grounds whatsoever. We may remark that it makes no difference whether the patient is in good faith; the act is wrong in itself. Good faith may excuse the patient from formal sin, but the Doctor who would advise it consents to the violation of the natural law and is himself guilty."[7]

JAMES MADDEN.

[7] A detailed discussion of the methods by which the semen may be obtained pertains more to the science of medicine than Theology. The two main points to stress are: 1) the sexual faculty must not be exercised outside lawful marriage, and 2) the conjugal act must never be interefered with so that conception becomes impossible.

Canon Law

TRADING FORBIDDEN TO CLERICS AND RELIGIOUS—RECENT DECREE.

The recently promulgated decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council concerning the trading forbidden to clerics and religious has prompted several queries. These are concerned with various transactions and activities—the sale of a used car, the sale of pamphlets, periodicals and religious objects at the entrance to the church, the conducting of a book depot or of a tuck shop in schools, buying shares, gambling, organising bazaars and allied entertainments in aid of church funds. It will be necessary to explain first of all the terms of the decree and its relation to the law already in force. After that most of the queries are solved by a simple application of principles.

The *pars dispositiva* of the Decree is as follows:

"In order that ecclesiastical discipline on this head may be made more securely established and more uniform, and in order that abuses may be guarded against, Our Most Holy Lord, Pius XII, by Divine Providence Pope, has deigned to lay down that all Clerics and Religious of the Latin Rite, of whom there is question in canons 487-681, not excluding members of the recent Secular Institutes, who personally or through others exercise *mercaturam* or *negotiationem* of any kind whatsoever, even in pecuniary matters (*argentariam*), whether for their own profit or for that of others, against the prescription of Canon 142, incur, as guilty of this crime, ex-communication *latae sententiae* specially reserved to the Apostolic See, and, if the case demands it, they shall be subjected to the penalty of degradation.

Superiors who, according to their office and power, do not impede those crimes, are to be removed from office and declared unfit for any charge of government and administration.

Finally, for all to whose fraud or fault the crimes committed are to be attributed, the obligation of repairing the damages caused remains firm."

Before examining the technical value of the terms *negotiatio* and *mercatura* in the penal law of the Church, it may clarify the situation to make some preliminary remarks.

* * * *

DECREE STRENGTHENS PENALTY ATTACHED TO *EXISTING* LAW.

The main import of this Decree is to enact penalties which are

incurred *ipso facto* in place of penalties *ferendae sententiae,* which were stipulated by the Code (Canon 2380). Substantially the prohibition in question is just as it has been prior to the Decree. Transactions which are forbidden to clerics now were forbidden just as definitely before the Decree; now, however, the canonical penalty is not only threatened, it is incurred *ipso facto.*

* * *

NATURAL LAW AND CLERICAL OCCUPATIONS.

The ecclesiastical penalties of the Decree, like those attached to previous legislation on this subject, are incurred in certain restricted instances of trading. It may well occur that certain practices which are not covered by this positive law are unbecoming to the clerical state and rightfully would be forbidden by Ordinaries.

From the very earliest times it has been the Church's aim to have clerics removed from many occupations which are legitimate in themselves but unbecoming to clerics—for example, trading. Such pursuits hamper the spiritual activities of a cleric's life. Further, trading was always considered to be an occupation in which a person could more easily indulge in dishonest practices or acquire an unhealthy regard for wealth. Throughout canonical sources laws are to be found prohibiting clerics and religious from engaging in trade. Special circumstances of time or place occasioned more stringent laws or called for more severe penalties. There was the Constitution *Ex Debito* of Pope Urban VIII (22 Feb., 1633) which imposed a stringent prohibition on trading by religious in Japan and other parts of the "East Indies." The reasons for that prohibition, as recorded by Vromant, were firstly, lest missionaries should become too eager to trade in order to acquire the material resources needed to preach the Gospel, and, secondly, lest the infidels should take offence or scandal at seeing the missionaries engaged in trade and thinking, perhaps, that a primary purpose of missionary activity was to open up trade to Europeans.

* * *

NEGOTIATIO AND *MERCATURA* AS FORBIDDEN BY CANON LAW.

Negotiatio, as forbidden by Canon 142 and the present Decree, means selling, at a profit, goods which have been purchased with the intention of selling at a profit and which have not been processed or improved in the meantime. The obvious example is the sale of goods which are bought at wholesale rates and sold at retail prices. Any shopkeeper is engaged in trading in this sense.

Mercatura means selling, at a profit, goods which have been purchased with the intention of selling at a profit and which have been processed by hired labour in the interval between purchase and sale. The manufacture and sale of goods by a factory proprietor normally would fulfil this definition.

The penalties are incurred by clerics and religious who practise or engage in (*exercentes*) trading in the senses just explained. There must have been not one transaction but a certain minimum number of dealings linked in a moral continuity.

The import of the words, "trading of any kind whatsoever" (*cujusvis generis*) is limited by the expression, "contrary to the prescription of Canon 142." The accepted interpretations of that canon are the guide in determining the extent of the canonical delict, which is now punished by excommunication. Therefore, when it is a question of canonical penalties we should adhere strictly to the two notions of trading expounded above. At the same time it is undeniable that some practices which escape these canonical penalties, nevertheless are unbecoming to the clerical state and should be banned by Ordinaries.

Several queries submitted may be answered simply by an accurate analysis of the notions defined above.

* * * *

SALE OF USED CAR.

A cleric is not forbidden to sell goods which he bought for his own use originally, but which he wishes to dispose of for some reason, e.g., a car. It may be of use to him no longer, or he may intend to purchase a newer model, or he may intend to use the proceeds in some other way, or he may be attracted by the current high prices of the used-car market. He may even receive a higher price, at least, nominally, than the purchase price which he paid before the war. In all such cases he is acting without violating Canon 142, because the intention to sell at a profit was not the reason for his acquiring the car. The same may be said of the other objects, furniture, books, radio, etc. Similarly, shares may be sold at a profit, on the supposition that they were not bought with the intention of selling at a profit, but rather with a view to collecting dividends.

These transactions are an integral part of the proper administrations of one's belongings. In the case of ecclesiastical goods it may be a duty for the administrator of them to arrange these and similar transactions in order to safeguard capital and dividends. These dealings are usually categorised by canonists as *negotiatio economica.*

It is a different matter altogether to purchase a new car (perhaps, in virtue of some "priority") at the official price, with the intention of selling it at a profit substantially unchanged, on the "open" market. This is trading in the sense of Canon 142, regardless of whether the selling price is considered to be "black" or "right." Whether or not a censure is incurred by such a transaction must be determined by applying the notion of "practising" trading.

* * * *

SHARES AND CURRENCY.

In the Decree the prohibition in question is enacted against those clerics who engage in *mercaturam seu negotiationem cujusvis generis, etiam argentariam.* The addition of the word *argentariam* removes all doubt concerning trafficking in currency. In the unstable post-war conditions of some countries a lucrative occupation has been the sale of currency on the "black" market. Again, disregarding any moral questions raised by "blackmarketeering," such transactions are forbidden to clerics; the currency is bought at a certain rate, with the intention of selling it, substantially unchanged, at a higher rate.

Likewise, buying and selling shares—speculating—is forbidden, as the canonical notion of *negotiatio* is verified. May a cleric purchase shares and hold them in order to collect the dividends? It is admitted, without difficulty, that debenture shares (*obligationes*) may be bought, as these make a person a creditor of an organisation, not a member. Buying debenture shares is just a form of lending one's possessions fruitfully—another instance of ordinary administration.

In the case of ordinary shares (*actiones*), opinions have differed. Some authors have argued that investments in commercial or industrial undertakings are not permitted, as a holder of ordinary shares is a member of an organisation which engages in trading, and, therefore, indirectly he is engaged in trade. As a member, he shares the responsibilities of the company; he is in the position of one who trades *per alios.* This opinion, however, seems too severe, and is based upon a very litteral interpretation of the law. In view of the very wide application of the ordinary term "trading," it would appear reasonable to take into account the purpose of the legislator to a greater extent here than in the interpretation of other laws. Shareholders who do not occupy an executive office in the Company are so remote from the actual operations that their part in the company's trading does not seem to come within the scope and purpose of the legislator's prohibition. Shareholders are traders only in a very theoretical sense. In

common estimation, too, they are not held responsible personally for the company's business transactions.

However, shareholders may not occupy executive positions in the company. Normally, they should not participate in meetings of shareholders—at least, with a view to exercising an active voice in formulating the business policy of the company. Some authors observe, with good reason, that there are occasions when clerical or religious shareholders should cast their vote in the election of directors, with a view to securing responsible administration.

SALE OF RELIGIOUS ARTICLES, BOOKS, ETC., IN CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS.

Several individual queries concern the sale of religious objects, books, pamphlets and periodicals at the door of the church, the supplying of books, stationery, uniforms, ets., in schools, the carrying on of a tuck-shop in schools. These undertakings may be carried on by private individuals, but it is supposed in this context that they are operated by clerics or religious, generally *per alios*.

These transactions do not come under the ban. Established canonical doctrine recognises in them a service to a community, so that the motive of profit is not their primary nor principal purpose. This applies, also, to the sale of votive candles in churches.

Traditionally, commentators recognised excusing causes to the law on trading, which were to be approved by the Holy See or the Local Ordinary. First amongst these was a cleric's own necessity and, in missionary places, an indult sometimes permitted needy clerics to carry on some becoming business as a means of livelihood. It is an extension of this idea to see in the needs of a community a reasonable basis for permitting such undertakings as those under consideration, provided that they could not be left suitably to layfolk. It is a good thing that Catholic publications should be available readily at the church-door, and it is equally desirable that control should be retained by the priest. It would create an air of commercialisation to have a shopkeeper setting up his business in the porch of the church.

It may be recalled again that a limited category of business dealings fulfils the requirements of the canonical delict. However, other practices may savour of what is unbecoming in the clerical and religious state and it is for the Ordinary to issue suitable regulations. Certainly, these services to the community could be carried to excess, to the obvious detriment of religion.

BAZAARS AND FANCY FAIRS

Some clerics have been disturbed greatly at the possible effect of the Decree on the traditional bazaar organised to augment parochial funds. No doubt, they are overlooking the fact that the prohibition of the Decree is the same as that already in force by virtue of Canon 142.

They may lay aside their fears. Many of the objects disposed of at a bazaar have been donated, whereas trading implies that an object has been bought with the intention of selling it at a profit. Moreover, patrons who purchase goods at a bazaar have come principally to give their donation to a worthy cause, the purchase of goods, often at a higher price, is a means of making a donation.

Gambling games, which are associated frequently with bazaars are another method of encouraging patrons to make a donation to the funds. In any case, gambling does not fulfil the conditions required to constitute *negotiatio*. Again, it may be unbecoming in some circumstances, but that does not make it an offence within the meaning of Canon 142.

* * * *

SHEEP AND WOOL.

The current high prices of wool have encouraged people to run even a small number of sheep as a means of supplementing their income. Are clerics and religious barred from this practice?

The produce of one's own land or the offspring of one's own livestock may be sold without breach of Canon 142. This is another instance of the canonists' *negotiatio economica,* as it forms part of the rightful administration of one's patrimony, or of ecclesiastical property entrusted to one's care. Thus, wool from one's own sheep may be sold; their lambs may be fattened for market. On the other hand, it would contravene the decree for a cleric to "deal" in wool, buying with the intention of selling at a profit.

Many methods employed to bring essential revenues to religious houses are justified in this way. Religious may dispose of wine manufactured from the grapes of their own vineyard, even using hired labour for the processing of the grapes. The conditions of *mercatura* are not fulfilled. Likewise, they are not fulfilled if the religious purchase the grapes and do the processing by their own labour—the condition of using hired labour is not present. On the other hand it is not permissible for religious to purchase raw material and have it fashioned into religious objects by hired labour with a view to selling them at a profit.

PENALTIES INCURRED FOR VIOLATING CANON 142.

In conclusion, it may be helpful to enumerate the penalties specified by the Decree. Their severity is evidence of the very serious view taken by the Holy See of this subject.

(I) Clerics and religious (also members of Secular Institutes) who engage in trading, in violation of Canon 142, incur excommunication *latae sententiae* specially reserved to the Holy See. In more serious cases, they may be punished with degradation.

(II) Superiors who, according to their office and power, have not taken steps to prevent such violations are to be deprived of their office and declared ineligible for any office of government and administration.

* * * *

BAPTISM ADMINISTERED PRIVATELY BY A NURSE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

What is the relationship between private Baptism administered by lay nurses in danger of death and the records of the Church? A number of individual questions will elaborate this question.

1) When a priest is certain of the correctness of the form of Baptism administered by a nurse, does he repeat the form of the Sacrament?

2) If certain of the Baptism, how does he make an entry in the register?

3) What is the canonical effect of Baptism administered by a lay person,

(a) in the case of a child whose parents were Catholics?

(b) in the case where a Catholic nurse baptized a child of non-Catholic parentage?

I ask these questions because many problems are arising when claims are made that adults had been baptized by lay people when in danger of death, from which they recovered.

F.G.

REPLY.

1) Baptism should be repeated conditionally only when there is a prudent or reasonable doubt as to the validity of the previous administration. That is the general rule governing repetition of a Sacrament. In the hypothesis the priest is certain of the correct administration of Baptism by the nurse. Therefore there are no grounds for repeating Baptism.

2) When Baptism is not administered by the subject's proper pastor, nor in his presence, the minister of the Sacrament should furnish, without delay, information of the administration to the proper pastor of the subject by reason of domicile (Canon 778). The pastor should make the appropriate entry in the register, noting the name of the lay minister, also noting that the Baptism was private.

3) These queries have been treated at some length in recent issues of the *A.C. Record* (Oct., 1949; Oct., 1950). The child of Catholic parents must be accounted as being baptized a Catholic. Whether, for canonical purposes, the child of non-Catholic parents, baptized lawfully in danger of death by a Catholic nurse is to be accounted as baptized in the Catholic Church is not clear. The weight of argument and of authority appears to favour an affirmative answer—when he has been baptized *lawfully*. What follows has been published previously, in the issue of Oct., 1950.

"In a certain sense, all who have been baptized validly may be said to have been baptized in the Catholic Church. However, in this context the phrase has a more restricted value and includes only those who, in receiving Baptism, are rightfully accredited to membership of the Church by the *intention* of the subject, if he is an adult, or of the parents or minister, if an infant is baptized. Thus an adult is said to be baptized in a certain church by reason of his requesting Baptism from the minister of that Church. In the case of infants, the request of parents or of lawful guardians will be the determining factor; otherwise the *intention* of the minister.

Children of non-Catholic parents may be baptized lawfully by a Catholic minister only in two cases; (1) if the infant is in such danger of death that it may be judged prudently that the infant will die before reaching the age of reason; and (2) outside danger of death, if due provision is made for the Catholic upbringing of the child, and if the request is made by parents or lawful guardians, or if these no longer exercise their office (Canons 750-751).

If an infant of non-Catholic parents is baptized unlawfully, in violation of these canons, and subsequently is brought up outside the Catholic religion, he should not be reckoned as one "baptized in the Catholic Church". If, however, such an infant is baptized lawfully, it would appear a reasonable conclusion that he is one "baptized in the Catholic Church", even though his subsequent upbringing is not as a Catholic. The weight of authority confirms this view; also, a private reply of the Holy Office concerning a child of infidel parents, baptized

in infancy, in danger of death, by a Catholic doctor and, subsequently, brought up in paganism. However, this conclusion is not beyond all doubt and we may hope for authoritative decisions or an authentic interpretation in the future".

JAMES CARROLL.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE MONTH, DECEMBER, 1950. No. 1000. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

On the occasion of the publication of the thousandth number of *The Month* the editors have asked the *A.C.R.* to bring *The Month* to the attention of our readers. They are too modest, as their monthly is well known in the English speaking world. A few years ago what appeared to be a radical change in the policy of the magazine, which became very much more literary in its matter, rather alarmed those who had grown to welcome Father Murray's green monthly visitor. But it is pointed out by the present editors the literary note was intended from the beginning to be predominant. *The Month* has the proud boast to make that in its pages Cardinal Newman's *Dream of Gerontius* first appeared. In 1875 or 1876 the then editors rejected Hopkin's *The Wreck of the Deutschland*—a most unfortunate decision, depriving *The Month* of an added literary glory. Over the years distinguished names among the English Jesuits, such as Gerard, Pollen, Thurston, and Martindale, have been closely associated with the paper. The present issue has articles and reviews by, among others, Father Martindale, David Mathew, and Robert Speaight. The price in London is 30/- per annum, which can be forward to the publishers.

T.V.

Liturgy

PROCESSIONAL CROSS—DEDICATION OF WOODEN ALTAR—RENEWAL OF PASCHAL CANDLE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Will you kindly give me some information on the following points:—

1. When the processional cross is carried during the Stations of the Cross, does the Figure on the cross face towards the Station or towards the people?

2. Is it necessary to consult the Ordinary in order to designate a wooden altar (side-altar) in honour of a Saint, with an image of that Saint over it?

3. It appears that in some places the same Paschal Candle is used year by year for the ceremony on Holy Saturday. Is this allowable?

IOANNES,

REPLY.

1. In the arrangement referred to by "IOANNES", the Cross-bearer is standing between the Station and the congregation. It would seem that, in accordance with the general rule for carrying the cross in processions, the Figure should face the same direction as the Cross-bearer. Consequently, if the Cross-bearer is facing the Station, then the Figure on the cross will be turned towards the Station, but should the Cross-bearer be facing the congregation, then the Figure, too, will face them.

2. The Code of Canon Law states that, as in the case of a church, so, too, at least every fixed altar must have its own proper Titular. There is not the same necessity for a Titular for a moveable altar as for a fixed altar. Moreover, the Titular of a moveable altar may be changed with the permission of the Ordinary, but not the Titular of a fixed altar. (Can. 1201, § 1 & 3). The image over a fixed altar must be an image of the Titular (*S.R.C.*, 4191, 4). The choice of the Titular of an altar normally belongs to the Ordinary, although the commentators point out that the Ordinary should give due consideration to the wishes of the donors, if any, of the altar (cfr. Coronata, *De locis et tempor. sacris*, n. 120). In the present case, therefore, if the Titular of the side-altar is to be changed, the permission of the Ordinary is required. Even if there is no question of changing the Titular of the altar, according to Coronata, the consent of the Ordinary should be sought in determining the Titular.

3. The Sacred Congregation of Rites was asked whether it was necessary to renew each year the whole of the Paschal Candle or merely that part of it which had been consumed. The Congregation replied that it sufficed to renew part only of the candle, so as to ensure that there is sufficient to last for the whole period of Paschal Time (3895, 1).

* * * *

BLESSING OF HALL BEFORE MASS—RESERVATION OF EUCHARIST WITHOUT WEEKLY MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Please answer the following questions in the *A.C.R.*:—

1. What prayer should be said for the blessing of a hall in which Mass is to be celebrated?

2. Is there any provision in Australia for moving the Blessed Sacrament from a church to convent chapel in which It is usually reserved? This sometimes seems necessary when it is difficult to offer more than one Mass per week in a small centre.

B.H.

REPLY.

1. It is not absolutely necessary to bless a hall or room in which Mass is to be celebrated, however, there can be little doubt that it is most fitting to do so, and indeed such is probably the usual practice. The blessing to be used is the *Benedictio loci* of the Ritual.

2. As far as is known there is no special provision for Australia which would justify the practice suggested in the query. The law requires, as a necessary condition for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, that a priest says Mass regularly at least once a week in the sacred place in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved (Can. 1265, § 1). In its recent Instruction concerning petitions for indults for reserving the Blessed Sacrament in private chapels, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments makes some observations that are fundamental in this question. It should be borne in mind, declares the Congregation, that the principal and first purpose of reserving the Sacred Species outside of Mass is the administration of Viaticum; but the secondary purposes are the distribution of Holy Communion in churches outside of Mass, and the adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ hidden under the same Species (cfr. A.A.S. 41 (1949), pp. 509-510).

FUNERAL MASS WITHOUT CORPSE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

If it is not possible to have a Requiem Mass on the day of the funeral, for instance on Holy Saturday, is there any restriction as to the time when the Funeral Mass may be said afterwards? A reply in the pages of the *Record* would be appreciated.

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

The Rubrics provide for a Mass to be celebrated as an integral part of the funeral rites. In order that this Mass should enjoy the privileges of a Funeral Mass the body must be present, if not physically at least morally. It may sometimes happen that it is not possible to bring the body to the church, for example during an epidemic, or in the case of death by drowning or some other accident when the body has not been found. In such cases a Requiem Mass, which enjoys all the privileges of a Funeral Mass with the body present, may be celebrated, provided that this Mass is celebrated not more than two days after the death of the person for whom it is offered. Some commentators on the Rubrics have thought that this time limitation was no longer binding as it was not expressly mentioned in the *Additiones et Variationes* to the general rubrics of the Missal, but a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites published in 1942 stated that a corpse cannot be considered morally present for a Funeral Mass more than two days after death. (cfr. *A.A.S.* xxxiv (1942), pp. 205-206). If, however, the celebration of the Funeral Mass is impeded by the rubrics, as it is during the last three days of Holy Week, then a Requiem Mass, with the privileges of a Funeral Mass, may be celebrated on the first day on which it is not similarly impeded by the rubrics. Beyond these two instances, a Requiem Mass may be celebrated on a convenient day after the receipt of news of the death of the person and this Mass is a privileged Requiem, but it has not the privileges of the Funeral Mass.

* * * *

ALTERATIONS IN ROMAN PONTIFICAL.

By Decree of 20th February, 1950, the Sacred Congregation of Rites made certain changes in the section of the Roman Pontifical dealing with the administration of the Sacrament of Order. These alterations were necessitated by the Apostolic Constitution issued by Pope Pius XII in 1947. In that Constitution the Pope declared that "the matter and the only matter of the Sacred Orders of Diaconate, Presbyterate and Episcopate is the imposition of hands; and that the form and

the only form consists of the words which determine the application of that matter... We ordain that at least hereafter the tradition of instruments is not necessary for the validity of the Sacred Orders of Diaconate, Presbyterate, and Episcopate" (cfr. *A.C.R.* xxv (1948), pp. 176-178). After enumerating the precise matter and form in each instance, the Pope concludes by saying that these things should be made evident in some way in the 'Roman Pontifical'. We give some of the principal alterations.

The sentence in the general rubrics before the Ordination rite which directs the Bishop to admonish the ordinand to touch the instruments, by the tradition of which the character is impressed, is now to be deleted.

In the Ordination of a Deacon, before the words of the Preface: "Emitte in eos, quaesumus Domine, Spiritum Sanctum, quo in opus ministerii tui fideliter exsequendi septiformis gratiae tuae munere roborentur", the new rubric is: *"Postea, extensam tenens manum dexteram, dicit verba formae sacramentalis, sine cantu:"*. The remainder of the Preface is said, as previously, with hand extended, but the new rubric adds: *"(quae extensio non est de valore)"*.

For the Priesthood the rite is unchanged as far as the words of the Preface: "Da quaesumus, omnipotens Pater in hos famulos tuos... exemplo suae conversationis insinuent", before which the new rubric reads: *"Postea dicit forma sacramentalis, quae dici debet sine cantu, extensis ante pectus manibus"*. In several of the subsequent rubrics the word "ordinandus" is to be changed to "ordinatus".

In the rite of consecration of a Bishop wherever the words "Episcopi Assistentes" occur they are to be changed to "Episcopi Conconsecrantes". Before the Preface, a new rubric directs the Coconsecrators to impose hands after the Consecrating Bishop, and to recite with him the remainder of the rite. In the Preface, before the words: "Comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam, et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructum, caelestis unguenti rore sanctifica" the new rubric is *"Postea dicit verba formae consecrationis episcopalis, quae dici debent sine cantu extensis ante pectus manibus:"*. In subsequent rubrics the word "Electus" is to be changed to "Consecratus".

* * * *

NEW MASS FOR THE ASSUMPTION—NEW INVOCATION IN LITANY OF LORETO.

On the occasion of the definition of the Dogma of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven, and in order to

commemorate that event, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, with the approval of Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, issued a new Mass in honour of the Assumption of Our Lady. The new Mass is to replace the present one contained in the Roman Missal. The text is given at the end of this section of the Record.

Moreover, the Pope has also decreed that a new invocation should be added to the Litany of Loreto. After the invocation, "Regina sine labe originali concepta—Queen conceived without original sin" is to be added the invocation "Regina in coelum assumpta—Queen assumed into heaven".

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

(*A.A.S.*, 1950, p. 793)

NOVA MISSA IN ASSUMPTIONE B. MARIAE V. APPROBATUR

Die 15 *Augusti*

IN ASSUMPTIONE B. M. V.

Introitus. Ap. 12, 1. Signum magnum appáruit in cælo: múlier amícta sole, et luna sub pédibus eius, et in cápite eius coróna stellárum duódecim.

Ps. 97, 1. Cantáte Dómino cánticum novum: quia mirabília fécit.

V. Glória Patri.

Oratio

Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, qui Immaculátam Virginem Maríam, Fílii tui Genitrícem, córpore et ánima ad cæléstem glóriam assumpsisti: concéde quaésumus; ut ad supérna semper inténti, ipsíus glóriæ mereámur esse consórtes. Per eúmdem Dóminum.

Léctio libri Judith

Judith 13, 22-25; 15, 10

Benedíxit te Dóminus in virtúte sua, quia per te ad níhilum redégit inimícos nostros. Benedicta es tu, fília, a Dómino Deo excélso, præ ómnibus muliéribus super terram. Benedíctus Dóminus, qui creávit cælum et terram, qui te diréxit in vúlnera cápitis príncipis inimicórum nostrórum; quia hódie nomen tuum ita magnificávit, ut non recédat laus tua de ore hóminum, qui mémores, fúerint virtútis Dómini in ætérnum, pro quibus non pepercísti ánimæ tuæ propter angústias et tribulatiónem géneris tui, sed subvenísti ruínæ ante conspéctum Dei nostri. Tu glória Jerúsalem, tu lætítia Israël, tu honorificéntia pópuli nostri.

Graduale. Ps. 44, 11-12 *et* 14. Audi fília, et vide, et inclína aurem tuam, et concupíscet rex pulchritúdinem tuam. *V.* Tota decóra ingréditur fília regis, textúræ áureæ sunt amictus eius.

Allelúja, allelúja. *V.* Assúmpta est María in cælum: gaudet exércitus Angelórum. Allelúja.

Sequéntia sancti Evangélii secúndum Lucam
Luc. 1, 41-50

In illo témpore: Repléta est Spíritu Sancto Elisabeth et exclamávit voce magna, et dixit: Benedícta tu inter mulíeres, et benedíctus fructus ventris tui. Et unde hoc mihi ut véniat mater Dómini mei ad me? Ecce enim ut facta est vox salutatiónis tuæ in áuribus meis, exsultávit in gáudio infans in útero meo. Et beáta, quæ credidísti, quóniam perficiéntur ea, quæ dicta sunt tibi a Dómino. Et ait Maria: Magníficat ánima mea Dóminum; et exsultávit spíritus meus in Deo salutári meo; quia respéxit humilitátem ancíllæ suæ, ecce enim ex hoc beátam me dicent omnes generatiónes. Quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est, et sanctum nomen eius, et misericórdia eius a progénie in progénies timéntibus eum.

Credo.

Offertorium. Gen. 3, 15. Inimicítias ponam inter te et Mulíerem, et semen tuum et Semen illíus.

Secreta

Ascéndat ad Te, Dómine, nostræ devotiónis oblátio, et, Beatíssima Vírgine Maria in cælum assúmpta intercedénte, corda nostra, caritátis igne succénsa, ad Te júgiter adspírent. Per Dóminum.

Communio. Luc. 1, 48-49. Beátam me dicent omnes generatiónes, quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est.

Postcommunio

Sumptis, Dómine, salutáribus sacraméntis, da quaésumus, ut, méritis et intercessióne Beátæ Vírginis Maríæ in cælum assúmptæ, ad resurrectiónis glóriam perducámur. Per Dóminum.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

THE FRUITS OF HOLY COMMUNION.

It is frequently said, and well said, that the Blessed Eucharist surpasses the other Sacraments in this: That in them we receive grace, but in this Sacrament, the Author of Grace. But this should not be understood as if Holy Communion were merely an especially intimate kind of visit to the Blessed Sacrament, and as if the benefits received in Communion were due to the fervour of our supplications to Our Lord present within us. Proper preparation before, and appropriate thanksgiving after, communion are, of course, ordinarily necessary; and generally, the fruit of our Communion will be rich in proportion to the fervour of such prayers. But that is because they generate within us the proper dispositions for receiving Communion. The Eucharist, like the other Sacraments, produces its effects by its own innate power, "ex opere operato," as it is said, and it is possible to make a profitable and fruitful Communion, even if, perchance, the usual preparation and thanksgiving has, by necessity, to be skimped or even omitted altogether.

The effects produced in our souls by a sacrament are symbolised by the sacramental sign itself. We receive the Blessed Eucharist under the form of food, and Its effects upon the soul are comparable to the effects of good food upon our bodies.

Food maintains life. The body consists of millions of cells, and these are in a constant state of renewal. The very business of living, every bodily function and every movement, conscious and unconscious, subjects the cells to wear and tear; and cells are constantly being injured by harsh contacts with other objects. If life is to be maintained, worn out and injured cells must unceasingly be replaced.

The body itself in its wonderful way manufactures the replacement cells from the raw materials supplied to it in food. The soul, too, requires nourishment if the supernatural life of grace is to be preserved. The very living of the Christian life is a constant strain upon our spiritual resources, and we are forever injuring ourself by sin.

The good food of the Eucharist supplies the wherewithal for the maintenance of our souls' life. If we neglect this food, death may be slow, but it is certain. "Unless you eat of My Flesh . . . you shall not have life in you."

Food supplies energy. It would be a poor diet that merely kept us alive. Good food, regularly and adequately partaken of, is necessary if we are to do any work. The soul, like the body, needs its regular and satisfying meals if it is to do anything worthwhile for God. "Without Me, you can do nothing".

Food promotes growth. A growing boy, it is said, eats as much as a man, and parents can vouch for the truth of the saying. Lengthening bone, strengthening muscle and enlarging frame require enormous quantities of food: under-nourishment stunts growth, retards development. Our bodies grow only until we reach maturity (although in some when vertical growth ceases, growth in circumference continues), but the soul is capable of growing ever greater and stronger. Grace is sharing in the divine life; and as long as we live we can more and more fully partake of that infinite life. Though Our Lady was saluted by the angel of the Annunciation as "full of grace", She continued all Her life long to acquire more and more plenitude of grace. Ordinary Christians, too, may grow daily more and more in spiritual stature, may share ever more fully in the divine life, but only if they regularly partake of the Flesh of the Son of God. "My Flesh is meat indeed, My Blood is drink indeed".

Food prevents disease. Scientists are still learning about those wonderful elements in food which keep the body sound and healthy. If our diet is deficient in these minute but powerful substances, strange and terrible diseases befall us. Prone to evil as we are from the sin of our first parents, our souls are ever threatened by the horrible disease of mortal sin. If this dread malady is to be warded off, we must have the medicine of our supersubstantial Bread. "This is the bread which cometh down from Heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die".

Food rejoices the heart. Hunger breeds despondency and discouragement. But the world looks a better place, and life is not so intolerable when we have taken satisfying food and comforting drink. Poor sinners that we are, we are sometimes sore in need of comfort. Our many falls, our strong temptations, our weak wills, our little fervour ...what wonder if we are sometimes dispirited. And so Our Lord, not always, but when He knows it to be necessary, gives us in Holy Communion a sense of well-being and encouragement, a renewed fervour and an up-lifted morale. "Come to Me all ye that labour and are burdened and I will refresh you".

Lastly, food cements friendship. It is the most natural thing in the

world to demonstrate and cement our friendships by entertaining at table. No reunion, no celebration is complete without the partaking of food and drink in the company of those we love. No union of friends at table is to be compared with the intimacy of the union with Our Lord in Holy Communion, when He condescends to become our very food. In that miraculous uniting of us with Himself, which is itself the most wondrous proof of His undying love for us, He pours forth into our souls a very flood of Charity, of that abiding love of God which will remain when Faith has changed to Knowledge, and Hope has been fulfilled. "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood abideth in Me and I in him".

W. H. BAKER.

Notes

NEW LIGHT ON THE DEATH OF ERASMUS.

In a recent number of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Vol. XLV, No. 1-2, Louvain, 1950, pp. 174-186) Henri De Vocht, of the University of Louvain, has thrown new light on the events surrounding the death of Erasmus. Erasmus died on the night of July 11-12, 1536, at Basle, during a night of storm. Basle was a "reformed" city, and the Catholic worship was forbidden by the authorities. Erasmus had been hoping to go to Brabant, but the printing of his books kept him at Basle in Froben's house, who was both his printer and host. In what disposition did the great scholar die? The earliest account stated that the dying Erasmus continually repeated: *O Jesu Fili Dei, miserere mei; misericordias Domini et iudicium cantabo*;[1] while the humanist, Beatus Rhenanus, on August 15, 1536, affirmed that Erasmus, up to the end, uttered the prayers: *O Jesu, misericordia; Domine libera me; Domine fac finem; Domine miserere mei! et Germanica lingua: Liever Got, hoc est: Chare Deus.*

Other testimonies are quoted by De Vocht, but the above give the substance of what was known of the mind of Erasmus. Moreover, as late as May 17, 1536, he had written in a letter: *Nemo nobis verbo molestus est, nec vellem habere domi qui novis dogmatibus esset infectus.* Even so, many Protestant writers would argue that Erasmus, at least, had not shown much enthusiasm for the practices and sacraments of the Catholic Church. In 1842, Mgr. de Ram, Rector of the University of Louvain, pointed out that the last servant of Erasmus was a Fleming, Lambert Coomans. Coomans was with his master that stormy night, and Coomans was a priest. Hence although there was no actual proof of the fact, it could be hoped that Coomans administered the sacraments, at least the Sacrament of Penance, to the dying humanist. Lambert Coomans was mentioned in the will of Erasmus, receiving 200 florins.[2]

The short note of de Ram was quoted and re-quoted for nearly one hundred years. It was felt to be a help to the theory that Erasmus was a

---

[1] This, the earliest account of the circumstances surrounding Erasmus' death, is found in a letter attributed to Stromer, physician of Leipzig, and sent to the theologian J. Cochlaeus. De Vocht, *l.c.*, p. 174.

[2] Assuming the Lambert of the will is Lambert Coomans, of which there is little doubt.

real Catholic, and that he had made his soul, dying with beautiful and Catholic words on those thin lips: *O Mater Dei, memento mei.*

Professor de Vocht denies de Ram's account almost completely. He is prompted to do so by one of the most recent quoters of de Ram's valuable little article, a Spanish Jesuit, R. G. Villoslada, who contributed an article to the *Miscellanea* offered to Cardinal Mercati in 1946. The article, entitled *La Muerte de Erasmo,* seemingly, was a serious study of the writings of Erasmus, made in an attempt to find out what the scholar's religious sentiments were. Naturally de Ram's note on Lambert Coomans, priest and licentiate in theology of Louvain, was noted by Father Villoslada, who concluded that Erasmus, in spite of being a *teólogo mediocre,* had an end that was *verdaderamente santa.* Both expressions cause Professor De Vocht to explode with some fury. For years he has lamented the fact that Erasmus is known to the world only as the author of the *Colloquia* and *The Praise of Folly.* The unfeeling world, thus, passes over a life's work for two brilliant, and perhaps outrageous, trifles. De Vocht sadly, but firmly, with that love which scholars show towards one another, asserts Villoslada got all his knowledge of Erasmus' theological knowledge from "some encyclopaedia". But that is but a mere whiff of grapeshot; the heavy cannons are brought up to demolish the Spanish Jesuit's compliment to Erasmus. To do this, de Ram and his note must be blown up. One can imagine Mgr. de Ram pleading for the survival of his note on Coomans that has gone around the world and back to Louvain, to the study of Professor De Vocht. War is cruel; and De Vocht is at war against those who trespass in his fields. So he proceeds to demolish de Ram's version of Lambert Coomans, priest and licentiate of theology of Louvain. When Coomans held the dying humanist in his arms on the night of July 11-12, 1536, he was neither priest nor theologian. Hence he could not have helped Erasmus except by prayers and encouragement. Such is the new version, which seems to be proved in a conclusive fashion. Lambert Coomans left his native town of Turnhout in 1532, seeking a post as servant to some scholar at Louvain. He was very young and had not yet begun his Latin studies. Van Gennep, professor of Hebrew at the *Trilingue Lovaniense,* with which Erasmus had many links, recommended the young Coomans to Cardinal van Enckenvoirt, who had followed Adrian VI, the Flemish pope and the last non-Italian pope, to Rome. Coomans, who was then twenty years old, remained in Rome until the Cardinal's death in 1534, receiving after the death of his master

the red silk trappings, which had once decked the mule of the unfortunate Adrian VI. He presented this interesting relic to his native town, where it was made into a cope which was used up to the time of the French Revolution. Coomans made his way back to Louvain, from whence, soon after, he set out to join Erasmus as servant, far more than secretary.[3] Erasmus for once had not demanded Latin as a necessary qualification for the post. He became attached to his master, following him to Basle in 1536. The healthy young Fleming, as Erasmus dryly remarked, was most useful in eating up all the delicacies that friends sent to the master, who was unequal to the task as he was tormented with the *chiragra*. *Placet Lambertus* was a very difficult old man's tribute to his last servant. On February 12, 1536, Erasmus put the name of Lambert in his will, leaving him, if Lambert Coomans was still in his service, 200 golden florins. Confined to his room for weeks, Erasmus, that eternal traveller, was preparing for his last journey. It was the young Lambert Coomans who held the dying Erasmus in his arms and heard the last words, words which Erasmus had used habitually: *O Mater Dei, memento mei.* After the death of his master, the executors of Erasmus sent him post haste to Brabant on a mission concerning monies that Erasmus had deposited with bankers in Brabant. Having obtained, at last, his legacy, he went to Louvain and began his studies. A few letters of his survive with his signature: *Lambertus Comannus, ultimus famulus Erasmi Rot.* After his ordination, he returned to his native town, Turnhout, where he led a useful and good life, becoming a canon and, finally, dean of the chapter. No doubt he often remembered at the altar his master and benefactor, whom he described as a *optimus et sanctissimus vir.* Coomans died in 1583, *septuagenarius maior.* He had told friends of the last moments of Erasmus, with the precious information that Erasmus died with the very Catholic prayer on his lips: *O Mater Dei, memento mei.*

Canon Cristiani once compared the careers of the two friends, Thomas More and Erasmus. Thomas More died a martyr; Erasmus has had to be content with being "canonized" by the devotion of scholars. There is a difference. In 1948, the last of P. S. Allen's monumental volumes of the letters of Erasmus, *opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami. Tom. XI,* 1134-1536, Oxford, came from the press, alas,

[3]Coomans carried a letter of recommendation with him from his Louvain patrons. It is interesting to know that in this letter was included the first news of the martyrdom of Sir Thomas More, which a certain Thomas Tebald had just brought to Louvain.

after the death of the great English lover of Erasmus. The eleven volumes contain 3,100 letters, which, together with the elaborate notes, make Allen's great work a veritable, and necessary, encyclopaedia of the reformation era. Three thousand and more letters in 6000 pages are a mere trifle in the eyes of De Vocht, as he wants us to see Erasmus as the pioneer of modern education, of the critical spirit, of the scientific approach to, and study of, theology. And this man was called a *teólogo mediocre!*

In a recent article on Erasmus by De Vocht, Father Villoslada must have been pleased to see that Aeneas Silvius became pope under the name of *Nicholas* II![4] He must have got it from an encyclopaedia, and a poor one at that, exclaim Villoslada and all who have been treated so roughly, but in a very tradesman-like fashion by H. De Vocht.

T. VEECH.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

GOING GOD'S WAY, by Mary Beattie. Gill. 150 pages.

The best tribute that can be paid to this little book is to disclose that it is a favourite with senior girls at a Sydney boarding-school, where it is the custom for any girls who so wish to make a short, private meditation in the chapel before Mass every morning. This reviewer admits surprise at their choice of book, as the matter, though excellent, seems to lack freshness in its presentation. But evidently this lack is more than supplied by the abundance of apt scriptural quotation. As the book is written for lay people, it deserves praise for leading its readers back to the Scripture, and encouraging them to meditate on the Word of God. The writer has a spiritual outlook, and a knowledge of the difficulties of Catholics in their struggle against worldliness.

The book is divided into two parts: one, on the love of God; the second, on love of our neighbour. In a series of practical instructions the reader is helped to think about such personal matters as: Prayer, Sacrifice, Judging Others, Conversation. It is to be recommended to lay people who think all too little about these problems. Such a book helps to jerk them out of their routine and to show them that the spiritual life is an interesting adventure that leads, even in this life, to contentment.

M.O.

---

[4] *La Renaissance en Belgique (Conférences d'Art et d'Histoire...Sous la Présidence du Vicomte Charles Terlinden)*, Brussels, 1945, p. 44.

Book Reviews

LES LIVRES DES MACCABEES. By F. M. Abel, O.P. Paris, Gabalda, 1949.

A Scotch presbyterian boy said that he liked the Old Testament better than the New, "because there was so much fighting in it." We need not and should not share his preference, but there is enough of the boy in the oldest of us to make us like a book of which war is the subject, and the fight is led by heroic patriots. Many priests would admit that they like the month of October for several reasons, but would probably put the reading of the Books of Machabees in the Breviary amongst those reasons. In the best sense of the word "thriller," those Books are amongst the greatest "thrillers" of the Old Testament.

But the Scriptures require more than epic reading. They demand study, and the study of the Books of the Asmonaean Wars is not the least difficult of the historical books. They require wide knowledge of Hellenistic history and Palestinian topography.

We cannot, therefore, but be exceedingly glad that the Commentary on Machabees in the "Collection d'Etudes Bibliques" of the Dominican School of Jerusalem was put into the able hands of Father Abel. This veteran scholar is a master of many things—a man of vast erudition—but he is particularly a master of Seleucid history and Palestinian topography. His monumental work on the Geography of Palestine will give us perfect confidence that we have here a secure guide to the places of battles fought by the Machabees on the mountains of Israel. Besides, over 25 years ago, Father Abel dedicated a long series of articles in the *Revue Biblique* to the topography of the Machabean campaigns.

The volume before us contains over 60 pages of introduction and some 480 pages of Greek text, French translation, and the author's commentary, which last includes 8 pieces of most useful excursus. Such titles as The Abomination of Desolation, Jews and Spartans, The Seven Machabee Brothers in Tradition, The Feast of the Hanukka, Sacrifice for the Dead, will excite the attention of every student. Two indexes of Names and Notable Details will assist the reader to gather together a Machabean geography and the main historical facts of a fairly complicated series of campaigns.

The introduction is as full as one could desire, but it is for the commentary, teeming with erudition, that we have above all to thank the

learned Dominican. At Jerusalem Father Abel is spoken of as a man who carries all his vast learning in his head. There is an occasional slip, as when the Torah and the Pentateuch are spoken of as different things (p. 26). "The good Homer sometimes nods," but he is still "the good Homer."

We hope that Père Abel will also give us in the near future a commentary on another book, which is full of geography, the Book of Josue.

W.L.

* * * *

TRACTATUS CANONICO-MORALIS DE CENSURIS. By F. Cappello, S.J. In-8. 4th ed. 1950. pp. xvi-480. Marietti, Turin.

In recent years, Fr. Cappello has given us editions of his various Canonical and Moral works. The present volume is the 4th edition of his well-known commentary on ecclesiastical censures. The author has been for a quarter of a century lecturing on Canon Law in the Gregorian University, Rome, and is besides a member of several Roman Congregations. The large bibliography which precedes the work shows the extent of his reseach, and the references on each page give us the prominent writers who support his views.

This edition contains recent Canonical Legislation. The most recent noticed is the inclusion of those who accept Communist atheistic materialism among 'heretics, apostates, schismatics' (n. 208). Later (n. 298) he decides that, while it is more probable that the Communist Party is a society whose members incur excommunication, still there is some doubt on the matter.

There is a full discussion of the Seal of Confession, of Absolutio Complicis, of Sollicitatio, and of the admission to the Sacraments, more laicorum, sacerdotum post attentatum matrimonium, et actu cum muliere caste conviventium. Forms of the various documents that may be needed for dealing with various cases are given. Finally, the revised censures concerning Papal elections are explained.

While expressing our gratitude to the famous author, we might ask, why was it thought necessary to make reference more difficult by changing the numeration of the paragraphs? It seems that it could have been avoided.

J.H.

EPISTEMOLOGY. By Fernand Van Steenberghen, Ph.D. English translation by Martin Flynn, Ph.D., S.T.D. New York: Joseph Wagner. 1949. Pp. 324.

Because things are for us, as philosophers, only in so far as we know them (for only to that extent can they enter into our consideration), the problem of what is entailed in the act of knowing is obviously of basic importance in philosophy. On that point all present-day philosophers are agreed. Yet embarrassing differences of opinion arise immediately there is question of fixing the object of epistemology, its method, and its place among the other branches of philosophy. This is true even among those belonging to the same historical tradition or professing allegiance to the same school; we see it among Scholastics, indeed, even among Thomists.

For Professor Van Steenberghen and the Louvain Thomist school, of which he is a member, the "critical" or epistemological problem is not wholly, or even mainly, concerned with certitude or the security of knowledge, but deals with the much wider and more fundamental problem of the very nature and value of all knowledge. In other words, for him the problem is not an accidental one arising from the fact of error, but is an essential one that must be faced at the very outset of any attempt to systematise our knowledge and thus build a critical philosophy that rests on no assumptions, but has examined and verified its foundations. To-day, he rightly contends, it is necessary not merely that our philosophy should, for its own sake, be critical, but that due prominence should be given to its critical and systematic character. This is so because system and method are among the main concerns of modern thinkers, and we cannot hope to merit their consideration until we have a fully developed epistemology that will enable us to meet them on their own grounds and argue as to how and where they have erred. Indeed, because historically, Thomism is only virtually a critical system, until we have made it formally so, and have presented it as such, modern philosophers will, not entirely without justification, continue to regard it as a sort of mosaic of philosophical fragments that have been more or less co-ordinated among themselves by the external influence of theology. It is, therefore, absolutely indispensible that we present Thomism in a way that will satisfy the strictest requirements of a critical and systematic philosophy; and that means that we must face the "critical" problem by beginning with a *constructive* examination of the problem of knowledge.

This task has been undertaken by Thomists during the last hundred years or so, and it is the results of their labours and his own mature reflection that Professor Van Steenberghen sets forth in his *Epistemology,* of which Dr. Flynn has now given us a very satisfactory translation.

The author divides epistemology into two parts: (a) Analytical or descriptive epistemology, and (b) critical epistemology. The first part consists of a detailed description of the data of the conscious act of knowing; in other words, it is purely factual, being made up of assertions that my consciousness testifies to the presence of such and such elements in the act of knowing. The method employed in discovering these facts is the only method possible, namely, that personal reflection which is really an accompanying awareness of what is taking place here and now in the field of my consciousness while I accomplish an act of knowing. Coupled with this is the much misunderstood and maligned universal, scientific, or methodic doubt. This latter, as the author points out, has been used from the earliest days of philosophical thought; it is implied in the Socratic irony, expressly applied by both Plato and Aristotle, and since then has become a classical procedure. St. Thomas called it a "universalis dubitatio de veritate," and demanded it at the beginning of the science of being. It consists simply in suspending judgment until such time as, by reflection, we have seen the evidence and find ourselves compelled thereby to accept certain facts as absolutely indubitable.

The second part, the Critical Epistemology, is concerned with the evaluation of these data of consciousness discovered by this reflection on our act of knowing. Whereas up till the present we have been concerned with "judgments of presence," we have now to make "judgments of value." But these latter are, like the former, immediate judgments; they are such that we cannot doubt them once we have become aware of them and seen the evidence of direct and immediate experience on which they rest. Neither here nor in the earlier section is there question of proving anything by the discursive reasoning. The sole purpose of the exposition is to show forth the evidence and thus make ourselves (and others) aware of these judgments which, once known, compel our acceptance.

Professor Van Steenberghen produces compelling evidence that there is an absolute criterion of cognitive value, a criterion determined by the final end of knowledge, namely, the possession of all reality. Furthermore, he shows that we actually possess that criterion in the

act of knowledge that expresses itself in the affirmation of being, the transcendental; for when we know being, the totality of all that is, we have a genuine possession of all reality in a way which, though confused, is nonetheless adequate and perfectly objective. This knowledge is adequate because the concept of being is formed by improper abstraction; it is infallible and perfectly objective because it rests on the immediate experience of an object outside which, since it is transcendental, there is nothing that could give rise to any illusion, confusion, or distortion in my knowledge of being.

Having shown that in our knowledge of being as such we possess an absolute criterion of cognitive value, Professor Van Steenberghen sets about applying this criterion to the rest of our knowledge, thus giving an evaluation of our knowledge of the different modalities of being, namely, the self and the non-self. Though this section will undoubtedly prove more interesting and of greater practical value to the ordinary reader, it is in the earlier part that Van Steenberghen makes his real contribution to epistemology.

It would be difficult to overstate the value of this small volume; not only is it a masterpiece of philosophical analysis, possessing at once profundity and simplicity, but it is the first work to treat the epistemological problem adequately and yet in a popular way. The English-speaking world is deeply indebted to Dr. Flynn for placing such a work at its disposal.

T.D.S.

* * * *

DE LA SALLE. Saint and Spiritual Writer. By W. J. Battersby, Ph.D. Pp. 207—xvii. Longmans, 1950.

Readers will recall Dr. W. J. Battersby's first published work, "De La Salle, A Pioneer of Education," which was reviewed in the *Record* for October, 1949. High praise was given for a work of painstaking scholarship, valuable not only as an historical study, but also as a tribute to a great educationalist, whose work is still being carried on by the Brothers of the Christian Schools whom he founded.

The present work completes the study undertaken in the former volume. Originally both were written by Dr. Battersby for the thesis which he submitted to the University of London for the Ph.D. degree. In the first volume Dr. Battersby described how De La Salle abandoned an ecclesiastical career, rich in promise, to undertake the education of

the poor, and to found the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The spiritual life of the saint, the secret of his courage and perseverance despite incredible difficulties, and the influence of his example and exhortations form the subject of the present volume.

In the historical chapters, the author gives further proof of his intimate knowledge of the great period of Louis XIV. So, too, the influence of the French School of Spirituality, St. Sulpice, and Jansenism on De La Salle are well treated. However, the chapters dealing with the spiritual life of the saint, though well documented, fail to impress his personality on the reader. Abundant proofs are offered of De La Salle's spirit of faith, love of prayer, and his devotion to the Child Jesus and Our Lady. But Dr. Battersby has not expressed the love and enthusiasm with which his contact with the writings of the saint must have inspired him. Perhaps he could not escape the restraints imposed by an academic thesis. We hope that he will be given a freer rein some day in the future.

J.G.

* * * *

THE MARY BOOK, assembled by F. J. Sheed. 309 pages. Sheed & Ward. London, 1950.

This is a really charming book. A reviewer has only to read and to praise. The dust-cover with pictures on both sides is the first attraction. They are paintings of Our Lady modern enough to make many young artists envious. A few readers may find them "queer" and disturbing, but they fascinate by their Gauguin-esque colouring and angularity. More, they achieve a touching reverence, with their Byzantine simplicity. We can realise the truth in St. Bernadette's appraisal of pictures of Our Lady: it was a Byzantine icon before which the peasant girl paused when trying to describe her heavenly Mother. The backward-turning glance of Western art to Byzantine lines may have in it more than a little of the guidance of the Holy Spirit. On such ground, a liberated and holy Russia could meet the West in a common culture, beginning their friendship in the company of the Lady who is "full of grace."

All the selections in this book are from writers of repute. There are poems by early English poets, then by Crashaw, Chesterton, Belloc, and G. M. Hopkins. The anthologist has wisely kept to modern writers in choosing prose extracts. Among these we have well-known names of English writers: Maisie Ward, Arnold Lunn, Ronald Knox,

Leen, T. S. Gregory, F. J. Sheed, and many others. Good translations are there also from French writers: Claudel, Journet, Godin, Guitton; and from Zundel and Hildebrand. And, still, we are omitting many names.

Looking through the poems, we realise their documentary value in any survey of devotion to Our Lady in England. As far back as the seventh century, English poems show the popular love of Mary. A gem in literature is that little poem, *A Brave-hearted Maid* (8th century), with its closing lines of appealing imagery:

> Bright on her breast
> Shone the radiant Child
> Who was the beginning
> Of all light.

One of the great attractions of this book is its literary beauty. Educated Catholics should be able to find in their spiritual reading delight for the mind as well as nourishment for the heart. They will find this book most satisfying.

The prose extracts on incidents in Our Lady's life, and on her place in *our* life are valuable expositions of every aspect of Marian devotion as it has developed through the centuries. And, as we read, we feel how important it is for us, living as we do in a secular atmosphere, to explain to those who are under our influence, the historicity of devotion to Our Lady. If we are teachers, we shall certainly have as pupils, girls and boys with Protestant relations and friends, who will need enlightenment on this very historicity. An article by Fr. Martindale treats this in a very satisfactory manner. An enquiring non-Catholic would read with interest and profit this and other contributions. There are several copies of Old Masters illustrating the book. (But why, why, that grotesque and undignified *The Virgin and St. Anne,* by da Vinci? Let us put some of the Rennaissance Madonnas on the very top shelf where illustrators cannot find them.)

A last word on what this book means to us: The phrase, "contemporaneity with Christ" may be awkward, but it accurately sums up the condition of our full and happy life as Christians. Living with Our Lord in His mysteries is still the only way of sharing deeply in His redemptive love. There we find Him with His Mother. We are all seekers, and this book is assured of a welcome, for it stimulates our courage, as we waver and stumble towards our goal.

M.O.

DE GRATIA CHRISTI, by Marcolinus Daffara, O.P. Marietti, Rome, 1950. 215 pp.

Two volumes of Dr. Daffara's excellent *Cursus Manualis Theologiae Dogmaticae* have already been reviewed in numbers of the *A.C.R.* (*De Deo Creatore, A.C.R.,* July, 1948; *De Peccato Originali et De Verbo Incarnato,* July, 1949). We were not stinted in our praise of his work then, and the present volume confirms us in our admiration of his clearness of thought and expression, orderly arrangement of matter, and sympathy with the student of theology who peers apprehensively into the profound depths of sacred mysteries. In fact, the whole *Cursus* leaves but little to be desired in a text-book for seminaries. Any professor who would adopt it for that purpose would have the satisfaction of knowing that a first-class text was in the hands of his students.

When treating of that *crux theologorum*—the nature of efficacious grace—the author clearly expounds the various systems, ancient and modern, which are so many witnesses to the failure of theologians to arrive at anything like a widely-acclaimed elucidation of the mystery, but firmly rejects all save the traditional "solution" of the Dominican School. Efficacious grace, he says, is not only a physical premotion in the supernatural order but a *physical predetermination of the will to the election of one only object, or act,* so that the will is *infallibly pre-determined* to perform that one action and no other. The author thus safeguards beyond all question what he is striving to protect: the supreme, universal dominion of God, the first Cause of all things. If, however, you should remind him of the other dogma involved in the question, namely, the free-will of man under that all-conquering, divine onslaught upon human psychology, he will calmly reply: God infallibly predetermines the will so that it *must* perform that particular action, and yet the infallibly-predetermined will freely chooses the action. In other words, God not only predetermines the will to one only action so that the will could never de facto choose another, but He at the same time sees to it that the will *freely* chooses. If you should ask him if the will could ever *actually* resist the physical predetermination, refuse to perform that one action, or perform another, you would be met with a stern reprimand for your foolishness in positing such a question: the two things are mutually repugnant, you will be told; it is unthinkable that God should thus infallibly predetermine the will and that the will should actually dissent. If you should raise further difficulties against this position the author will take refuge behind the omnipotence of God who

reaches from end to end *fortiter* and disposes all things *suaviter*.

The question, then, ultimately comes to this: if the will, before ever it acts, is physically predetermined to one thing only so that of metaphysical necessity it must elicit that act to which it is irresistibly and infallibly moved, how is this compatible with active indifference of the will, which means that the will is such a mistress of its activity that it can act or not, do this or do that? Surely these two concepts are mutually exclusive and therefore incompatible: a) "The free determination of oneself to act"; b) "The physical, unthwartable predetermination of the will to one act only, imposed by another will, before ever the will can determine itself".

God cannot achieve what is metaphysically impossible. But it does seem metaphysically impossible that the will should at one and the same time be physically predetermined *ad unum,* and not physically predetermined *ad unum*. It seems there is only one perfectly-timed blow here, and the will is rendered *hors de combat*. It is certain that the will can never actively resist the predetermination. To do that it would have to receive another premotion predetermining it to resist. What a sorry plight this would be! What a rendering-asunder of man's psychology! The will would simultaneously be predetermined to perform the action and not to perform it. In such a system of theology the soliloquizing gentleman with his "to be or not to be" could certainly never play his part. He would be reduced to a hopeless impotency.

The Council of Trent defined that man, "when receiving efficacious grace, is also free to reject it". (Sess. 6, cp. 5.). But in the system under discussion freedom to reject the grace seems to be outside the realm of possibility. A man cannot reject it unless he be infallibly predetermined to reject it. But if he is already infallibly predetermined to accept it....

The author enthusiastically claims the whole-hearted patronage of St. Thomas in this matter, but a close study of the Saint's writings proves that he will have none of it. It seems beyond all doubt that St. Thomas taught physical premotion as a fundamental principle, but he certainly did not hold with physical predetermination of the will to one action only, as was later introduced by Banez and became ever afterwards the very soul of the Dominican School's body of thought regarding all the dealings of God with man in the natural and supernatural orders. Many texts of St. Thomas, of which the following are average examples, cut the ground from beneath the feet of Predeterminationists:

"The potency of the will, considered in itself, is indifferent as regards this or that action; but that it should determinately choose this or that action, *this choice does not come from anyone else determining the will to it, but it comes from the will itself*". (2 Sent., D. 39, Q. 1, a. 1). Again, when commenting on a certain text of St. John Damascene, he says: "The will cannot go contrary to that towards which it has been determined by the ordering of divine providence, that is, contrary to its final end. But it can make contrary choices as regards those things which it determines for itself, as in the means which are directed towards the final end, *the choice of which belongs to the will itself.* (4 *Sent.,* D. 41, Q. 1, a. 3, ad. 1.). Surely such statements can have no place in the opinion defended by the author; so he conveniently ignores them.

St. Thomas establishes again and again the same principle that the will has such a control over all its actions that, notwithstanding the absolute dominion of God, the First Cause, "the determinate choice of this or that action is left in the power of the intellect and will". (*De Potentia,* 3, a. 7, ad 13). In his system of theology a *predeterminatio ad unum* is equivalent to a *vis necessitans,* and a *vis necessitans* radically destroys liberty which, for him, is an *indeterminatio* or active indifference to this or that action.

We feel that the author, as much as he abhors the idea, must be content with the patronage of Banez. It is too late now to concoct a dose of irresistible predetermination designed to move infallibly and by metaphysical necessity the will of St. Thomas to such a rigid system of theology. All his works rebel against it.

Although we cannot accept the author's attempted solution of this problem—the most difficult of all theological problems—we repeat that the pure food of God's revelation is presented in this volume with great purity of insight, maturity of judgment, clarity of thought, and expression, all pointing to a soul that has meditated long and deeply on this mystery of God's love by which we, being men, are made gods.

T.M.

* * * *

EASY DOES IT. The Story of Mac. Hugh Reilly. New York, P. J. Kenedy Ltd. Price: Three Dollars.

Alcoholics Anonymous is a fellowship through which men and women alcoholics have attained sobriety and help others to recover from alcoholism. It is fifteen years since *A.A.* came into existence. To-day

it numbers in U.S.A. alone 100,000 and is increasing at the rate of 20,000 a year. It has spread throughout the world and is established now in more than thirty countries. Australia was the first country outside the States to introduce *Alcoholics Anonymous.* Several Groups are established in all the capital cities and in several country centres in this country.

It is estimated that 50% of those who join *A.A.* become sober immediately; 25% do so after some slips. The rest show an improvement. Many of these eventually attain victory. Psychopaths and those whose brain has been injured by prolonged drinking and those who will not accept the Programme of *A.A.* in its entirety do not get sober. It is true to say that any man or woman who sincerely accepts the *A.A.* Programme and lives it will attain sobriety and happiness.

Hence it is not surprising that in U.S.A. the results achieved by *A.A.* have attracted the attention of the medical profession and of religious leaders. The claim of *A.A.* that it has found a solution of the alcoholic problem (hitherto regarded as an insoluble one) cannot be put aside lightly.

A book dealing in popular fashion with *A.A.,* its theories and methods was to be expected sooner or later. Now it has been attempted and with success. Such a book is *Easy Does It.* It is the autobiography of an alcoholic who through drink had found "hell upon earth", but was restored to sobriety through *A.A.* It is the first book to tell the story of *A.A.* from the inside.

The Story of Mac is based on fact. Mac is a real person and he gives us a genuine account of his fearful experiences with drink and a very heartening history of his ultimate recovery through the methods of *A.A.*

It is perhaps to be regretted that so much sentimentalism has been allowed to intrude. It renders the book less objective and analytical than otherwise it might have been. Mac is much fictionised. So is "The Padre", who indeed is described as "a complete portrait of four men, not unlike the four immortal chaplains commemorated on a three cent stamp....neither Catholic, High-Church Protestant, Evangelist or Jew". Towards the end a romance is dragged in and we seem to be in the realms of genuine fiction.

However, in spite of this the book is well worth while. It is a contribution to the popular literature on alcohol which is valuable and will repay reading. It is also the best popular description of *A.A.* that has

appeared. It gives an accurate exposition of the technique of *A.A.* and has succeeded in catching the spirit which animates the Fellowship.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I.—The Ramp down—is a vivid description of an alcoholic in the throes of his awful disease. It is told in fifty pages of Typescript which Mac hands to the Padre to read.

"You'll never know the blood and sweat and tears that went into this, Padre, the liquor I consumed and the hangovers I had to cure to write it".

Reading these vivid pages one can realise the truth of these words of Mac to the Padre. In them you see the genuine alcoholic, the insatiable craving for drink, the means honest and dishonest used to obtain it, the excuses for obtaining it and drinking more, the mental twists of the alcoholic mind, the horrors of the hangover, the remorse and despair. It is a graphic picture of the ravages alcohol can make upon the human personality.

But in these pages and throughout the book emphasis is laid upon a fact that is not sufficiently known. It is that alcoholism is a genuine sickness. The alcoholic must be treated as a sick man if his drinking is to be arrested. The reader will also learn in these pages that it is impossible for the non-alcoholic to understand the mind of the alcoholic or to gain his confidence. That is why when in his desperation Mac appeals to the Padre for help, the latter feels as helpless as many of his confreres no doubt have felt in like circumstances. However, the Padre had heard of *A.A.* and gets in touch with it. Soon the machinery of *A.A.* is in motion for the salvaging of another victim of alcohol.

Part II.—Towards the Step Up—gives an excellent account of *A.A.* at work. It shows the understanding and efficient work of the two ex-alcoholics in handling the first stages of the patient's recovery; their steady progress in his re-education and his final introduction to the full stream of *A.A.* therapy. It tells of the patient's bad slip and of his final and lasting recovery.

Incidentally in this Part one is introduced to the wing of a big city hospital totally set aside for alcoholics. This is a luxury we do not yet possess in Australia. The genial doctor who presides over the wing may well be Dr. Silkworth, who helped the Founder so much in the early days of *A.A.* It is Dr. Silkworth who writes the Foreword to this book.

Part III—Twelve Steps Up—opens with a chapter which is to be

commended to the attention of all who have relatives or friends who are alcoholics, and to priests who so often come into contact with these victims of alcohol. Many practical suggestions are given which will help much in the proper handling of these difficult cases.

In this Part the famous 12 Steps of Recovery which are the basis of the *A.A.* treatment, are described. The exposition is not so exhaustive as that given in the official "Interpretation of the 12 Steps", but it is sufficient to give the ordinary reader a clear insight into the philosophy of life advocated by *A.A.* which has proved so successful in restoring alcoholics to sobriety.

It is worth noting that in the light of this exposition these Steps are patient of a true Catholic interpretation. This is very important. For it follows from this that every Catholic member of *A.A.* must interpret the Steps in this Catholic sense. He must shape his life according to the Steps so interpreted. In other words, if he is honest, he must take up the full practice of his religion. Else he will not remain sober. Experience, moreover, is at hand to bear this out.

There is another conclusion to be drawn from this. It is that the Catholic alcoholic seeking sobriety through *A.A.* has much need of a priest who understands his problem and also understands the solution of the problem proposed by *Alcoholics Anonymous*.

We commend this very readable account of *A.A.* It will interest the general reader while to relatives and friends of alcoholics and to priests and social workers it should prove very helpful.

R.J.M.

* * * *

CATHERINE McAULEY, THE FIRST SISTER OF MERCY. By Roland Burke Savage, S.J., M.A. M. H. Gill and Son. Price, 15/-.

It has been truly said that as there is in nature an antidote for every poison, so in the Catholic Church there is a Religious Order or Congregation for the alleviation of every form of suffering of soul or body.

Father Burke Savage's fascinating biography, the fruit of considerable research, is based largely on hitherto unpublished documents, and throws fresh light on Catherine McAuley's life and work. It portrays for us an Irish lady whose intense love for the poor was almost a passion, and who began her noble work under great difficulties and amid much opposition.

The Dublin in which Catherine was born in 1781, almost fifty years

before Emancipation, was certainly not favourable to Catholicism. To make matters worse, her parents died while she was still young, and her upbringing was entrusted to Protestant relatives. But though deprived of a Catholic atmosphere and unable to uncover even a crucifix in her room, she clung tenaciously to her most precious heritage, the pearl of great price. For her it was not a treasure to be hidden in a napkin, but one that must be shared with others. She resolved, therefore, to consecrate her life to God and to devote all her energies and resources to the relief and instruction of the poor. In this she had the blessing and support of Dr. Murray, the Archbishop of Dublin. With the money she inherited from her aunt and uncle she was able to establish her first charitable institution, a House of Mercy in Baggot St. for the protection of poor women and girls and the education of children rescued from Protestant schools.

When Catherine embarked on her great career she naturally had no clear-cut vision of her future life-work. Her original idea was to gather round her a small group of lay-women who were prepared to devote themselves to the service of the poor. To this plan for a lay organization she clung resolutely for almost three years after her House in Baggot St. had first opened its doors to the poor. But inspired by a tender devotion to the Mother of God under the gracious title of Mother of Mercy, to which she had been strongly drawn from girlhood, she sought the Archbishop's approval to dedicate the House to Our Lady of Mercy. This was done on 24th September, 1828, the Feast of Our Lady of Mercy, and from that day her institution was known as the House of Mercy.

Her 23,000 spiritual daughters who to-day form the largest congregation of women in the Church of God, and who are found in almost all countries, girdling the world with mercy, are the best witnesses to the merciful charity and kindly vision of Mother Catherine McAuley that made her a leader in the fields of education and social welfare twenty years before Karl Marx proclaimed his brotherhood of man in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848.

R.W.

* * * *

THE DIDACHE, Epistle of Barnabas, Epistles and Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, Fragments of Papias, Epistle of Diognetus, translated by James A. Kleist, S.J. (Ancient Christian Writers, *Edit.* Quasten

and Plumpe, Catholic University of America, No. 6). The Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, U.S.A., 1948. Pp. 235, 2 dollars, 75 cents.

The sixth volume of the Quasten-Plumpe translation of ancient Christian writers is the work of Father Kleist, who displays great care in translation and brings much learning to the introductions and the notes. It is the right of a reviewer always to want the whole loaf. Hence one laments the absence of the original text printed alongside the impeccable translation. Reviewers can dismiss the objection that the price of the book would be doubled.

We have then a translation printed in clear type. A short introduction precedes each document, setting out the history of the document, its characteristics, and a list of the editions of the text. The text is then given; finally the notes on the text are at the end of the book. Readers in English, we are told, will not read footnotes at the bottom of the text, and, they, moreover, resent their eye and attention being dragged away from the text to the irritating footnote. Hence the notes are confined to the end of the book, which is extremely irritating for those who enjoy footnotes. Father Kleist has already dealt with the epistles of St. Clement and St. Ignatius, so now he translates the remainder of the documents, which are usually gathered under the section of Apostolic Fathers. The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, is a writing of the first century, and its precious few pages bring us very close to the primitive Christians. The evidence of the Didache on baptism and the Eucharist are well known. The Epistle of Barnabas is the work of an unknown author who felt the dangers rising from Bar Cochab's movement among the Jews. He adopted the radical method of allegorizing the Old Testament completely. The short writings of and the glorious and authentic Acts of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp of Smyrna follow. To read the sober account of the death of the venerable bishop is to have a vivid moving picture of a martyrdom placed before one's eyes; the stark truth, not the exaggerations of a legend. The book concludes with the few extracts that remain of the work of Papias of Hierapolis, and the Epistle to Diognetus, which is an apology for Christianity, which Father Kleist thinks may be the lost Apology of Quadratus. There can be no doubt that this series will bring before many readers the old documents which are the very basis for any sound study of christian antiquity. They will form an invaluable collection for the English speaking world.

T.V.

ARNOBIUS OF SICCA: THE CASE AGAINST THE PAGANS. Translated by George E. McCracken. 2 Volumes. (Ancient Christ. Writers). Newman Press, Maryland, U.S.A.

Arnobius of Sicca, if indeed he is of Sicca, is not one of the better known writers. In a careful introduction Fr. McCracken gives most of the information that can be gathered about his life and times, and discusses the problems arising from the scanty biographical notices of Arnobius which have come down from antiquity. It is very strange that scholars cannot make up their minds as to whether Arnobius was a Christian or not, for there cannot have been many writers whose personality appears more clearly in their writings, and Arnobius is certainly writing, with considerable enthusiasm, a defence of Christianity. It can be admitted that his enthusiasm is sometimes stronger than his logic, particularly in the sixth and seventh books, and furthermore that his knowledge of Christianity is often very confused. It is quite refreshing to find a writer who is ready to admit that he does not know the answer to a difficulty, as Arnobius does many times. He has great courage in facing many problems, such as that of free will (p. 96) and the necessity of grace (p. 146). It does not seem to have been pointed out that in his discussion of the immortality of the soul, which he denies, Arnobius has a very confused idea of immortality. He confuses immortality with eternity, and denies the immortality of those who are not saved because they have not existed from eternity, and on the other hand have not deserved the gratuitous immortality which is given as a reward to the just. There are traces of agnosticism in Arnobius, particularly of the Manichaean variety (p. 149), and of agnosticism (p. 168). He does not know the origin of the soul (p. 158) or of evil (p. 165); and he inclines to fatalism (cf. p. 292). He is weak in his ideas about providence (p. 209). Nevertheless Arnobius is quite clear in his affirmation of the divinity of Christ (e.g. p. 171), and anticipates some of the stock arguments and methods of a modern treatise on theodicy (cf. pp. 148, 207), and has something to say about the reconciliation of grace and freewill (p. 176). The arguments are sometimes repetitive, and there are some inconsistencies in his ideas, but Arnobius is worth reading and often interesting.

The translation by Fr. McCracken is clear, and the references to works studied show that very little which could be a help to a clearer presentation of Arnobius has been overlooked. Arnobius is himself a somewhat obscure writer, but, with a few exceptions, the translator has

made the narrative clear. A few Americanisms mar the work as for instance: "Would he have the gall to say .. .." (p. 417); the obsolete "brashness" (p. 461); the verb "rest up" (p. 95); and several latinisms like "obligate" and "negate".

J.S.K.

* * * *

MOTHER PATRICK OF PARIS: An Irish Mother of the Blind: Adapted from the French of Canon Elie Maire of Notre Dame Cathedral, Paris. By "Africanus". (Gill: 100 pages).

This biography, though suffering the literary limitations of an adaptation, is an inspiring story. In the preface and in several lines throughout the book, "Africanus" reproaches his compatriots for that strange paradox in their national life: hundreds going out every year to the mission fields, while those who stay at home cultivate an insular cast of mind. But surely they are proud of Mother Patrick, intrepid, European in outlook. She is magnificent. It is good that the English-speaking world has been given this account of her life and work with the Blind Sisters of St. Paul in Paris. As we read the book we feel consoled to know that there is at least one Order (there may be others) where blind girls may become nuns. The blind nuns are particularly successful with the blind children for whom the work was established. There are several interesting photographs—one of a group of little girls in the care of a postulant. It moves us to reflect that she will never see their smiling, confiding faces, nor they, her grave beauty.

In 1863 Mother Patrick Devin of Drogheda was drawn to Paris in an unusually supernatural manner. Only once during her long life did she return to Ireland, and that visit was a flight ordered by her Superiors in 1870, during the Franco-Prussian War when the Germans captured Paris. After the war and when the Germans had gone, Mother Patrick came back from Ireland, and from then till her death in 1911 she worked and lived like a saint in her convent in Paris. The work for blind children developed and prospered under her care. Four times in succession she was elected Superior-General. During her second term in that office she had the sorrow of losing several of her nuns in the historically disastrous fire at the Charity Bazaar, 1897.

All during those years the growth of anti-clericalism made her life one long anxiety. In 1905 there was a terrific blast of atheistic anti-clericalism, and the Blind Sisters of St. Paul were ordered to dis-

band. Mother Patrick refused to desert her blind children. The account of her perseverance and of her skilful handling of the situation make stirring pages of heroic biography.

M.O.

* * * *

THE UNKNOWN GOD. Alfred Noyes. Sheed and Ward, London, 1950. 8/6.

From its first appearance in 1934 this excellent book has been reprinted many times; and the eighth impression, dated 1949, has been enlarged by an Epilogue of ten pages, in which the author considers briefly the latest developments in the art of warfare, as instanced in the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, in their bearing on the general topic of his book. He believes that the mental outlook which devised the bomb, and the moral conscience which approved or condoned its use, render more imperative than before the need of recognizing the fact that "the whole race of mankind needs forgiveness" (p. 328).

The book itself was recognized from the first as being an outstanding spiritual biography. The author early realized that the question of the attitude of man towards God was the most important question in the world; and he tells us how he sought God, and found Him, by the strange path of Agnosticism. He traces the course of his enquiry in clear and charming prose. The story, besides being extraordinarily interesting, has the rare merit of showing an understanding of philosophy both scholastic and modern. Almost alone among laymen writing in English, the author knows what is meant by metaphysics, and is competent to discuss the impact of metaphysics on the practical problems of life and behaviour.

In a book that is splendidly written, and in which fine reasoning is finely expressed, it is hard to select a few passages or chapters for special praise; yet the fourth chapter, which deals with the centrality of man, and the fifteenth, which shows how the great writers and poets of the world were vaguely aware in their questing of the great ultimate realities which are the theme of the book, perhaps deserve to be singled out.

If a criticism must be made, it may be pointed out that in the fourteenth chapter the author has for once been at fault. Professor Whitehead is quoted as saying that the undulatory and the corpuscular theories of light are contradictory, and Noyes replies that the contradiction is

only apparent. In point of fact it is not even apparent, for the two theories are not even contrary. If they were contradictory, then necessarily one would be true and the other false; if they were contrary, they could not both be true, but might both be false; whereas they are not mutually exclusive, and may both be true at the same time. Each would then have the defect of being inadequate; but it is not necessary to suppose that either of them is false.

This book can be recommended to anyone who is in doubt about God. It is the story of how one man was led to God; and it must have helped to bring many others to Him also.

J.S.K.

* * * *

THE GOSPEL STORY, Vol. I. R. Cox, C.M., Auckland, 1950. (5/-, N.Z.).

Fr. Ronald Cox, professor of Sacred Scripture at Holy Cross Seminary, Mosgiel, N. Zealand, has prepared a book, with this first volume of a proposed two volume Gospel story, which is just what so many Catholic teachers, young Catholic Actionists, and an ever-growing number of Scriptural enthusiasts have long been looking for. This first volume, dealing with the Infancy and the Galilean ministry, is a rather unusual book; it is, as Fr. Cox himself puts it, "two books under one cover". The left hand pages present us with the Gospel story arranged in one continuous narrative according to Mons. Knox's translation of the Vulgate. The right hand pages carry Fr. Cox's very readable, sound, and informative explanation, in continuous form, of the sacred text. The first volume covers seven chapters, so interlinked and interdependent as to show the intentional development in the divine revelation. It is this appreciation of the whole which gives this work special value. Our Lord, in this first volume, is presented as engaged in the gradual work of founding the Church which is to bring the fruits of His redeeming mission to mankind. The second volume will tell the story of Our Lord's redemption of mankind by His death.

Fr. Cox never loses time on controversy. It is his intention to give a clear-cut, uninvolved explanation of the Gospel for the non-specialist. He embodies into his text what he considers the most satisfactory explanation, even though, as Fr. Cox knows, such an explanation may raise certain technical difficulties. We venture to make a few suggestions which could, we believe, add to the usefulness of this most praiseworthy book. A map of Palestine and a sketch of the

Temple would facilitate an understanding of the Sacred Text's or Fr. Cox's references to Ain Karim, Jericho, Jordan, etc., as well as references to "Court of Gentiles", "Women's Court", "holy of holies", etc. The ordinary reader is often vague, to say the least, about such references. Again sub-headings for the Gospel text may assist the reader, v.g., The Annunciation, The Presentation. The undivided chapter is not the best pedagogical ruse. Finally, would the ordinary reader appreciate the significance of the Jewish people's expectancy of divine intervention because Herod, a foreigner, the first, sat on the throne of David? And what meaning has five shekels or ¼ shekel to the ordinary Catholic Action boy or girl? One further explanatory sentence on some of these matters would have clarified things considerably. One or two printer's errors, like the omission of "of" in the important phrase, "it was of her that Jesus was born" (p. 15), can easily be corrected in another printing.

This is a work which can be warmly recommended, not only for those groups mentioned above, but even for priests in their sermon and catechetical instruction preparation. It is an example of clarity, solidity, and reverent treatment of sacred things. This volume is priced at 5/- (N.Z. currency) and reduction will be made for quantities ordered from C.Y.M., 16 Victoria St., Auckland, N.Z.

H.G.D.

* * * *

SAINTS ARE NOT SAD (Forty Biographical Portraits). Assembled by F. J. Sheed. (Sheed & Ward: 389 pages).

This book is more satisfactory than its title with its suggestion of merry anecdotes. True, it is entertaining, but soberly so, for it is a collection of sketches, thoughtfully written about thoughtful people. In an Assembler's Note we are told that of the forty sketches only two have been written specially for this book, the others having been published in various books and periodicals. The names of these publications would have given pleasure to our curiosity. Apart from that, surely publishers who handle the work of Catholic writers could do with a little encouragement when such an opportunity as this is offering.

Readers of Father Martindale's book, *What Are Saints,* will recognize his eight contributions. Goodier's *Saints For Sinners* is the source of another seven. We have not seen Fr. Vincent McNabb's before—and how good they are, especially his St. Columbanus and St. Malachy. Hilaire Belloc's sketches of St. Thomas of Canterbury is

familiar, but how well worth inclusion in this and any other book of saints. Most of the saints selected are historical figures.

That mention of history brings us to the real value of this book (and we hope the idea will not completely cancel out its pleasant if honeyed title)—the book is a magnificent introduction to a study of the history of Western Civilization. For fifteen hundred years the history of that civilization received its bias from the lives of the saints. As the forty sketches before us are arranged in chronological order, we are led at once into an engrossing course of European history, beginning with St. Paul, and ending with St. John Bosco and St. Thérèse of Lisieux. Straight after St. Paul, we have the translation of a documentary account of the martyrdom of SS. Perpetua and Felicity. Walter Shewring is the translator, and he has given us a moving account of these martyrs of the early third century.

No matter which sketch we take, we find the saint's life touching European history at so many points, that it confirms us in our idea that Church history and European history should never be put into separate compartments in our schools. By thus divorcing them, we fail to give European history the human setting it needs; we also fail to give to the lives of the saints the heroic stature that is their due as world heroes. Secular history books recently published do try to give some of these heroes their rightful place in the building up of western civilization; but teachers need such a book as this to adjust the balance between the secular estimate and the view of Truth. Nowhere does this truth force itself on our judgment so urgently as in reading Belloc's St. Thomas of Canterbury.

This essay of Belloc's may be read and enjoyed at any time. It has everything: touching human interest, literary style and historical clarity. Belloc brings out clearly that the heroism of St. Thomas postponed for four hundred years the disaster that befell Christendom in the 16th century. If the assault of the temporal power against the eternal had succeeded in the 12th century, the Church would hardly have recovered. "At the beginning of the great medieval spring, the Church would have failed". St. Thomas saved the Church and saved society. Belloc notes that this "was instinctively felt by the common people, through whose spontaneous piety Almighty God achieves his purposes more widely than through any other channel, save perhaps through the channel of individual holiness and courage". There comes to our mind the remark of Léon Bloy: that only saints or their antagonists can serve as landmarks of history. M.O.

TWO IN ONE FLESH. Rev. E. C. Messenger. Sands and Co., London, 1949. 3 Volumes.

This work, in three volumes, totalling less than four hundred pages, is a first attempt to meet a great need. It is a brave book, and the author is to be commended for writing it. His intention is to deal of frankly with sex and marriage, as the sub-titles of the separate volumes show. It is probable that the work will be found more useful to directors of others, than to those who are in need of direction. A great deal of patient research had to be gone through before this book could be written. One could say that the main theme of the book is that sex is not something to be ashamed of, and that the exercise of the sex faculty, far from being something that can be connived at, or merely permitted, is in itself a noble and religious activity (see particularly Vol. 3, c. 9).

It is possible that many will feel, along with the present reviewer, that the blame given to the moral theologians and Catholic writers for having induced a state of mind that looks upon sex as containing unpleasantness and uncleanness, is not earned by them. After all it was not the theologians who persuaded Homer to speak of the 'aidoia', or who introduced the term 'verenda' into the vocabulary of the Latin pagans.

The discussions on the sense of shame in Vol. 2 is good; and so are many of the digressions on virtues such as modesty in various parts of the book. Sometimes, but not often, the argumentation is weak, or weakly presented, as for instance in the Chapter on The Variations in Moral Ideas (Vol. 2, pp. 65-68). A most interesting question is raised in this volume on p. 94, namely, the Immediate Animation Theory. If, as the author suggests may be possible, this theory comes in the end to be abandoned, a number of problems will have a more satisfactory theoretical answer than at present; I refer to problems regarding the baptism of a foetus, and the number of human beings who die, apparently in the ordinary course of nature, without ever having had the least chance of being cleansed from original sin.

Sometimes the references to authorities are not accurate; for instance the reference to the Summa 1, q. 98, a. 3, ad 4, which is given on Vol. 1, p. 19, should really be to q. 97; and even then the passage in St. Thomas has not quite the bearing and sense in which it is interpreted by the author. Vol. 2, p. 197, has a negative omitted at the end of the first line, and this makes nonsense of the quotation from St. Augustine, which, by the way, is quoted from the Summa 2, q. 164, a.1 diff.1.

While this is the first book to deal with the problem of sex in detail in English, it is to be hoped that it will not be the last.

J.S.K.

* * * *

S. THOMAE AQUINATIS. IN X LIBROS ETHICORUM ARISTOTELIS AD NICOMACHUM EXPOSITIO. Cura et Studio P. Fr. Raymundi M. Spiazzi, O.P. Taurini, Marietti, 1949; xv-611. 1700 lire.

S. THOMAE AQUINATIS. IN ARISTOTELIS LIBROS DE SENSU ET SENSATO; DE MEMORIA ET REMINISCENTIA COMMENTARIUM. Editio 111 ex integro retractata cura et studio P. Fr. Raymundi M. Spiazzi, O.P. Taurini, Marietti, 1949; vii-130. 350 lire.

The value of a new edition of the commentary of St. Thomas on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle is pointed out by Fr. Spiazzi in his introduction. There is an urgent need for men of our age, surrounded by erroneous and defective systems of moral philosophy, to return to a clear understanding of the principles of the Natural Law, which govern the conduct not only of the individual but also of society. Thomistic philosophy offers itself to all as an ideal guide. The genius of the Angelic Doctor created in the field of moral science an original synthesis, which combines whatever is of value in the ethical systems of the Greek philosophers, particularly Aristotle, with the teaching of Christian Tradition. The principal Aristotelian sources upon which St. Thomas drew in formulating his system, are the Nicomachean Ethics and the Politics, and indeed this intensive commentary on the Ethics is proof of the comprehension that St. Thomas had of the mind of Aristotle. Moreover, the commentary provides us with an exposition of moral doctrine based on the principles of the Natural Law and developed by philosophical reasoning.

Following Msgr. Grabmann and Fr. Walz, Fr. Spiazzi suggests 1269 as the probable date of composition of this commentary, although, due to a misprint, the date appears as 1279 (p. ix). A recent inquiry of G. Verbeke (Revue philosophique de Louvain, xlvii, 1949, p. 203-220) would favour about 1260 as the more likely date. The introduction also contains a schematic diagram of the whole work and a brief summary of the contents of each of the ten books.

The Editor did not aim to offer a critical text but reproduced sub-

stantially the same text as in an earlier edition by Fr. Pirotta, O.P. Marginal numbers facilitate reference and schematic synopses abound throughout the edition. A valuable 'Index rerum notabilium et nominum' (p. 567-604) is provided.

The edition of the two minor commentaries—De sensu et sensato and De memoria et reminiscentia, both of which are complimentary to the treatise De anima, is a companion volume to the above work, which it follows in general arrangement and format.

In these volumes the publishers offer us a very useful and pleasing edition of the writings of St. Thomas.

P.L.M.

* * * *

ON PRAYER, by J. P. de Caussade, S.J. (London: Burns Oates), 272 pages, with a Preface by Dom Chapman, O.S.B.

It must have been a hazardous calling in 18th century France to be a director of souls. And unless one found oneself in a House where direction was sound it must have been equally hazardous to be a Religious. Even taking a cheerful view of the religious scene, we feel that some of the Lord's elect must have had arid lives. In the matter of prayer most of the theologians of the first half of the century recognized only two modes: 1) formal meditation, 2) a quasi-miraculous form of prayer accompanied by ecstasies. The prayer of simplicity that purifies and transforms the whole being of many Religious now-a-days —that strengthening prayer of repose in God—that was suspect in the eyes of Jansenist theologians.

The reason for this is to be found in the religious history of 18th century France, where, in the previous century, Molinos and other Quietists had brought contemplative prayer into disrepute. It is to Bossuet that we owe the brilliant reputation of the harmful doctrine of Quietism which would have its followers abstain from *all* acts during mental prayer—and the suspension was to be continuous! As Bossuet puts it: "The Quietists had only to rest in a leisured and disastrous security". All through his masterly refutation Bossuet calls on the teaching of the Church from its earliest Fathers. He points out in numerous places that, without mortification, humility and the overcoming of self in the practice of virtues, there can be no true prayer.

Hardly was Quietism routed than a new evil attacked religious life. This evil was Jansenism which abhorred all contemplative prayer. The

Jansenists had a great field, chiefly because of the horror with which religious people had come to regard Quietism. We may imagine with what anxiety such men of prayer as Père de Caussade viewed the whole situation. But a Jesuit of that day might well pause before coming out in defence of contemplative prayer. Indeed, any priest would hesitate to do what would surely bring on him and his Order the fury of the Jansenists. But Caussade's experience, both as a man of prayer and a director of souls, was so strengthened by the influence of Bossuet, that he resorted to the wise plan of writing a book on prayer, basing all he had to say on the authority of Bossuet. He knew no one would lift a voice against his great bishop's fame. (The book of Caussade under review was first published in an English translation in 1931.)

The first part of the book is occupied entirely with Bossuet's refutation of Quietism. It may seem now of a merely academic interest, but perhaps it is not unlikely that this false mysticism may, again, during our life-time, gather a large following. A reading of Aldous Huxley's book, *Perennial Philosophy* leads one to this opinion. Again, what *did* a visiting materialist mean in his Australian lectures recently when he spoke of the need for contemplation? Not what Bossuet meant; not what Caussade meant; not what any of the saints meant.

The second part of the book should be an invaluable help to many Religious and to people whose spirit is turning to the prayer of tranquility and repose in God. To those who already know Caussade's teaching on the doctrine of self-abandonment, this part of the book will be a delight, for it will show them that the prayer of simplicity is the very expression of their self-abandonment to Divine Providence. The persistent questioner who extracts all the information from Caussade is so agreeably thick-headed at times that we feel kinship with him—but everything is asked, everything is answered. Here is an example of the method and matter:

Q. Why is it that certain people so fear vanity in contemplation?

A. Because they know it only by the name which dazzles them and not by the practice which humiliates.

Caussade then goes on to say that there is nothing so humbling, so destructive of human pride as contemplation. (Whenever he speaks of *contemplation* in this book, he means the prayer of simplicity or recollection.)

The good effects of contemplative prayer are well set forth: "In this prayer, one acquires the pliancy and docility of a child to respond to

the least sign of the will of God for the putting to flight of evil or the performance of good deeds". And we are well within the domain of Caussade when we read on various pages the connection between the prayer of simplicity and a perfect mistrust of ourselves and complete confidence in God. Then comes the inevitable question: Is this prayer for me? Our persistent questioner gets the answer for us: We can dispose ourselves for it by leading lives of humility and recollection. Also, if we are still making a daily formal meditation, we can dispose ourselves for ordinary contemplation by making longer, and still longer, pauses in our reasoning to remain with love and adoration in the presence of God. And what an oasis would be this prayer of repose in the lives of busy apostles. Or are we so tough that we can get along without an oasis? Job was certainly of tough fibre, but let us read over some of his lovely, tender passages. They will bring us near enough to God for Him to refresh us. It would be good for us, if, like Job, we would sometimes say: "I have but to keep silent and implore the mercy of my Judge".

Caussade is a sure guide. As we follow him remember with new courage that our renunciations are not an end in themselves. They are our steps to freedom, where, self-love being checked, we can find, even in this life, all our happiness in God's love.

M.O.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

By Pontifical Appointment

Publishers to the Holy See

NOW available for the asking is the first complete catalogue of our books to be issued since 1937. The war removed, to a large extent, the very *raison d'être* of the catalogue by blasting and burning the books off the face of the earth: the stocks at the head office in Newgate Street by St. Paul's disappeared with the large building which housed them, so, too, did other stocks in printing works in Plymouth and many other places.

This is not said with any note of self-pity but to explain what might otherwise seem an unnatural reserve about our productions. *Primum vivere* . . . They had to exist again before we could begin to philosophize or talk about them. They have been creeping back into existence steadily for the last five years, and may now be said to be representative of our traditional strength, like a stricken army driven underground and emerging to do battle once more in organized form. Anyone who compares this list with earlier ones will find that not a few books have been "killed in action," others are "missing," and may still return; they will also see that there has been considerable reinforcement from new recruits. Each year has seen perhaps a third of the latter joining up with two-thirds of the old guard, and from now onwards the tendency will be for the new to outnumber the old.

In every field of Catholic intellectual activity the tendency towards renewal from one generation to another is evident. So here, in this list, will be found new names in many fields: in theology, a de Lubac; in philosophy, a Copleston; in spirituality, a van Zeller. . . . For the Bible, itself, there is, of course, the new translator: it seems incredible that there was no Knox version in 1939. Again, the Missal, which held pride of place in our catalogues for twenty years and more, has been translated anew throughout, to give a fresh significance to words and phrases worn smooth and out of recognition like old coins.

This does not mean to say that we are unmindful of those classics which have been for so long the spiritual sustenance of the faithful in this country. The war may have puvlerized them but they have risen from the ashes: Augustine Baker, *The Cloud, The Confessions,* Chal-

loner's *Garden of the Soul* and many another. The Orchard Series, which included so many of them, disappeared, but it is coming to life again. Whenever possible, the necessity of replacing one or other of these books has been taken also as an opportunity for making some editorial or typographical improvement. There is nothing so progressive as maintaining a tradition.

* * * * * *

A word might be said on one aspect of publishing and not commonly undersotod. It is only natural that there should be complaints, or at least regrets, at what is taken to be the high price of books nowadays, for the simple reason that no one has enough money to buy all that he might reasonably need. But the truth is that in books there is now relatively better value for money than in almost anything else. Book prices, of course, have gone up because the costs at every stage of production have gone up: paper costs three and a half times what it did before the war, on an average; printing three times; binding two and a half times; most publishers' own overhead costs have trebled. It cannot be said that book prices have gone up proportionately to all this, still less in proportion to the price of all sorts of other commdities: in your bookshop you may need fifteen shillings where you needed ten in 1939, but in any other shop you will need a pound or two, to go as far as your ten-shilling note in pre-war days. There are various ways of counteracting the rising cost of books. We have, for example, adopted a principle in some standard works like Lagrange and Lebreton, or useful handbooks like Fr. Roche's *Apologetics for the Pulpit,* of producing the two and three volumes of their pre-war editions in one. But the main check on book prices is in the hands of the public. Broadly speaking, the price of a book can come down as the public demand for it goes up. Readers of this list can stimulate that demand in all sorts of ways: public libraries can be asked to stock certain books, others may be made the theme of study-circles, circulars and catalogues may be had in any quantity and passed on . . . at least there can be no complaint now that there are not enough books to choose from.

One last word: Burns Oates would not feel itself to be the institution that it is—like the weather—if there were no complaints at all. We would like readers to be assured that complaints, criticism and suggestions are positively welcomed by their agent in Australia (quondam a Managing Director of the firm),

PATRICK ANDERSON,
15 Dominic St.,
Melbourne E.6.

EFG ENGLISH AND FOREIGN BOOKSHOP,
28 MARTIN PLACE, ROOM Y15, SYDNEY. PHONE BW 9807
and AMP LANE off EDWARD STREET, BRISBANE

Harold Monro: 20th Century poetry ..... 10/6, post 5d
Aristotle: Constitution of Athens ..... 29/6, post 6d
Unesco: Freedom and culture ..... 25/6, post 8d
Philip Talbot: South Asia in the World to-day ..... 45/-, post 8d
Erasmus Roterodamus: Inquisitio de fide ..... 42/6, post 9d
Charles Peguy: The mystery of charity of Joan of Arc ..... 16/-, post 6d
William Boyd: The history of western education ..... 33/6, post 10d
Charbonneaux: La sculpture Gracque Archaique ..... 28/6, post 8d
Herbert Tichy: Auf einem Huegel der ewigen Stadt ..... 25/6, post 8d
Daniel Rops: Jesus en son temps ..... 20/-, post 6d
Olivier St. John Gogarthy: I follow St. Patrick ..... 14/9, post 6d
Art Treasurers of the Vatican ..... 74/3, post 2/2

GRAMMARS AND DICTIONARIES IN ALL LANGUAGES FOR MIGRANTS

CATHOLIC ART AND CULTURE

Statuary,
Church Plate,
Metalware,
Vestments.

Literature and Pious objects.
There's quality and economy, too, at:

Pellegrini & Co.
PTY. LTD.
Head Office: 543 GEORGE ST., SYDNEY. M 4171.
AND IN ALL AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL CITIES.